

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. XVI.

JANUARY, 1897.

No. 3.

[FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.]

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE IN THE PRE-CHRISTIAN CHURCH.¹

BY GEORGE J. LOW.

IN the early years of that movement in the Anglican Church which has been called in turn Tractarianism, Puseyism, Ritualism, and the Catholic Revival, a work appeared from the pen of the Rev. (afterward Cardinal) J. H. Newman, entitled "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine." It created no small stir at the time, though seldom noticed now; yet its influence was more permanent than that of even his famous "Apologia," published much later, and its leading thought was more valuable to the Christian world.

The aim of the book was to defend the Church of Rome, which he was about to join, from the charge commonly alleged against her of having made unwarranted and unscriptural additions to the original faith. His argument is that these additions to the faith were but its logical and necessary corollaries; and to this end he first lays down (in Chap. I.) the principle that all ideas—religious ideas included—must needs grow and expand and take shape in the course of time, ac-

¹ 1. "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," by John Henry Newman. New York: D. Appleton.

2. "Lux Mundi." (New York: J. W. Lovell Co.) Essay 2, "On the Christian Doctrine of God," by Rev. Aubrey Moore, and Essay 8, on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration," by Canon Gore.

3. "The Idea of God," by Professor John Fiske.

cording to circumstances. Then, after dilating upon the "Process and Kinds of Development," he propounds seven distinctive tests of a "true development" as against a "corruption" of the original idea. These are: 1. Preservation of Type. 2. Continuity of Principles. 3. Power of Assimilation. 4. Early Anticipation. 5. Logical Sequence. 6. Preservative Additions. 7. Chronic Continuance.

There is an obvious and striking analogy between the positions here laid down by Newman and the principles of organic evolution as advanced by Mr. Herbert Spencer and the modern naturalists. And when we remember that the essay in question was published in 1845—some twenty years, if I mistake not, before the publication of Mr. Spencer's "First Principles"—we can see how in many points the theologian anticipated the philosopher.

In our author's application of the tests to the development of Christian doctrine on the lines of the Church of Rome, there may be details which, to the Protestant mind, savour of special pleading; nevertheless the leading idea of the work is of great value, and is adopted to-day by divines of all classes. For example, Principal Fairbairn, in his essay on the "Primitive Policy of Islam" (*Contemporary Review*, December, 1882) says: "No religion is born complete; the interpreter is as necessary to it as the interpreted; the society that realizes the ideal as the ideal that is to be realized. And the process of interpretation or realization, while it may seem one of formal or even of radical change, is yet one of real, though variously conditioned, historical development." This is an admirable summary of Newman's argument.

If such is the case, we may well look upon the variations among Christian sects as so many species and genera evolved from the original idea—as to whether any particular variety is a "true development" or a "corruption" or degeneration. I suppose we must leave it to time to apply the seventh test of "Chronic Continuance," or survival of the fittest. Certainly the curious in such matters might interest themselves in

tracing the "hypertrophy" or the "atrophy" of this or that "organ"—the "rudimentary" or the "vestigial" stage of this or that dogma—in many a "variety" of the Christian "family;" one can trace, in his own lifetime, many a denominational "species" gradually modifying its structure or its habits in "adaptation to its environment." Here is another illustration of the natural law in the spiritual world.

But if this doctrine of development is applicable to the Christian Church, it is much more applicable to the Church of the old dispensation, and to the pre-Christian revelations of God to His chosen people. If fifteen centuries were required to develop the primitive baptismal formula into the elaborate Confessions of Faith of the reformers and of the Council of Trent, much more may we expect that the fifteen centuries which preceded the Incarnation saw a like development of the original deposit of faith granted through Moses to the children of Israel. As to the ages before Moses, the further back we go the more elementary must needs have been the religious idea.

Now, this is a consideration that should be always borne in mind in our study of the Old Testament. It is better apprehended now than formerly; the "higher criticism" is forcing it into notice. Yet still the popular superstition lingers that the Old Testament is one book, given at one time, and as much the product of a single generation as the New Testament undoubtedly is. Indeed, the very word "Testament" is misleading to many minds, because it is suggestive of "the last will and testament" of some individual, a single compact document, signed, sealed, and delivered at some precise moment. The word "Revelation," too, as applied to the Bible, is somewhat inexact; for the Bible is not so much *the* revelation as the *record* of the revelation; or, rather, of the several successive revelations of God to His people—God having, "at sundry times and in divers manners"—in many portions and in various ways—spoken "in times past unto the fathers by the prophets" (Heb. i. 1).

The Old Testament is made ever so much clearer,

and is ever so much more valuable, and is freed from ever so many stumbling-blocks to the faith, if we bear in mind that it was a work of slow growth during fifteen hundred years, the accumulation of the records of the several revelations of God to His chosen people.

We are beginning to realize the fact that the ideas of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or even of Moses and Joshua, must have been far more elementary than those of the later prophets.

The development of doctrine in the pre-Christian Church must have been commensurate with the development of men's idea of God. We may well inquire, therefore, what was the conception of God in the patriarchal mind, and how did that idea subsequently develop? And I think we shall find a clew afforded us in Exodus vi. 2, 3, where it was written: "And God (Elohim) spake unto Moses, saying, I am the *Lord* (Jehovah). And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty (El Shaddai); but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them."

If, then, we take our text literally, we may infer from it, and from Genesis xvii. 1, that the name by which the Deity was known to Abraham and his successors was "El Shaddai," and that at the time of Moses He was further made known to them by the name "Jehovah." Now, this means more than the mere fact that another word was added to the religious vocabulary of the Israelites; it means that they spoke of—and *thought of*—God in another way. For the idea of "El Shaddai" is that of Power; the idea of "Jehovah" is that of Eternal Self-existence.

And here, again, we are reminded of Mr. Herbert Spencer's philosophy. He begins his whole system ("First Principles," Chap. I.) by speaking most reverently of "the Power that is manifest in the universe;" he alludes to all the phenomena of nature as "manifestations" of that inscrutable "Power." But he closes his system of philosophy with an humble acknowledgment of the mystery that we are "ever in the presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things

proceed." The light of nature, which alone of course his philosophy pursues, has led him thus far. The faint light of nature had been supplemented ages ago by the more glorious light of special revelation to Abraham and to his seed, and had brought them, by the time of the Exodus, to the same conclusion as that reached with lifelong toil by the modern philosopher, that "El Shaddai" was also "Jehovah;" the Almighty was also the Eternal.

Israel, by the grace of God's special revelations, was the advance guard of all humanity in its progress toward the knowledge of God; the divine light accorded to them, "at sundry times and in divers manners," enabling them to push their way through the dense jungle of natural ignorance, while their fellow-mortals were left, as St. Paul puts it (Acts xvii. 27), to "seek God if happily they might feel after Him and find Him," slowly and blunderingly toiling on, aided only by the light of nature.

All this is in accordance with what we should judge was the evolution of the idea of God in the childhood of the world among the races unaided by revelation. The savage of primitive times, seeking to probe the mysteries by which he was surrounded, found himself, like the philosopher of to-day, confronted by Power—Power everywhere. And naturally, too, the destructive powers of nature, being more obvious and awful, would most impress the savage mind. The growth of all living organisms was so gentle and unobtrusive an operation, while the catastrophes and convulsions of nature were so terrible, that his awe of the Power which can destroy would easily overmaster his sense of the constructive Power. The tree which he had seen standing all his life, which the oldest patriarch of his tribe had remembered from childhood, is shattered in a moment by a bolt from heaven; the storm blows down the forest and lashes the sea into foam; *that* is the Power to dread.

"Lo, the poor Indian, whose untutored mind
Sees God in storms and hears Him in the wind."

So, too, in the minds of the earlier Israelites "the ter-

rors of the Lord" were uppermost. The darkness and thunderings of Sinai, the earthquakes, the storms, the fire of the Lord, the arrows of the Lord, the voice of the Lord in the thunder, were the frequent themes of their poets. "Come behold the works of the Lord, what desolations He hath wrought in the earth" (Ps. xlv. 8). And this is indicated in the very name "El Shaddai," for the root-idea of "Shaddai" is "destruction."¹

The idea which people form of the Creator must needs be more or less commensurate with the idea they form of His creation. In the infancy of the race, when men conceived the earth to be a flat plain about the size of Europe, surrounded, as Homer sang, by the stream of ocean, the heavens a star-spangled dome which could be described with a radius of a few miles, the conception of the Supreme Being could not possibly be the same as ours, whose minds are lost in the contemplation of countless millions of worlds in the infinity of space. Their ideas were doubtless like those of the children of to-day. Do we not remember, however faintly, the time when we were "little things," when God was conceived by us as a Man "writ large," sitting on His throne, superintending the world, of which our own locality was the main part? And as our conceptions of the universe enlarged, did not our conceptions of the Creator enlarge correspondingly?

The learned tell us that in the genesis of each infant the various stages of the evolution of physical man are recapitulated. Methinks in the growth of each individual mind, if we could study it out, we could trace a similar recapitulation of the various stages in the de-

¹ From שָׂרַר, "*vastavit*." It is true that some Jewish rabbis (of the Middle Ages) would derive it from יָרַר, "*sufficiens*," but this seems fanciful and strained—see Buxtorf under both words—the repetition of שָׂר in Isaiah xlii 6 and Joel i. 15. כִּשְׂר מִשְׁרֵי, "as destruction from the Almighty," settles the point in my mind. The student will notice that the double name, El Shaddai, occurs several times in Genesis and very often in the Book of Job, chaps. iii. and xxxvii., where "El" and "Shaddai" are paired, so to speak, in the parallel lines of the poem.

velopment of the idea of God : the " anthropomorphic," the " transcendental," the " immanent" ideas of the Supreme Being gradually settling down and blending in due proportion as we grow older. The prophet Hosea (ii. 1) speaks of the nation of Israel collectively as " a child," when in Egypt : of that " child" we may say in St. Paul's language, it " spake as a child, it understood as a child, it thought as a child" in Divine matters. And so the revelation of God to them was very gradual—" line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little" (Isa. xxvii. 10), as they were able to bear. Even the primary doctrine of the unity of God, though taught persistently from the very beginning of their national life, was not fully learned by them till after the Captivity in Babylon.

If the *gradual* nature of revelation—the development of religious thought and of religious teaching—is borne in mind in the study of the Old Testament, many difficulties and seeming incongruities may be removed. Such " anthropomorphic" expressions as we find in the earlier parts of Genesis (*e.g.*, iii. 8 ; vi. 6 ; viii. 21 ; xi. 5-7), which we instinctively feel would be out of place in Isaiah, are yet suitable enough for the instruction of Israel when " a child." Even the gorgeous imagery of the " Isaiah of Jerusalem" (vi. 1-4) would seem out of place amid the still more sublime passages of the " Isaiah of Babylon" (xl. 12-18 ; lvii. 15 ; lxvi. 1, 2).

So, again, the idea of God's righteousness was gradually enforced on the Israelitish mind. Their knowledge was increased not only by clearer and clearer intimations of " Him that was to come" and of " the salvation of our God" which " all the ends of the earth" should some day see, but also by higher and higher ethical teaching and by nobler and nobler presentments of God ; until the Power who could destroy became more and more regarded as the Power which makes for righteousness.

The light of revelation has progressed on the same lines as the light of nature, but always in advance of it, among those to whom the revelation was vouchsafed, teaching them with authority what the " seekers after

God," without its aid, could only surmise. But the light vouchsafed to Israel, though shining more and more throughout the centuries, did not arrive at the perfect day until the Sun of Righteousness arose. The children of Israel, led on by that early light, discerned that the God whom their forefathers adored as Power was also the One Eternal Lord of all; and in due season they further realized that God was the Holy One and the Righteous. But the highest ideal of all—though dimly foreshadowed in times past when God spoke by the prophets—was not made known unto the sons of men until these last days when He hath spoken unto us by His Son; for it was only by His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection, that we could realize the crowning truth that "God is Love."

[FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.]

AUGUSTINE AND THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

BY PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.

XI.

THE THEOLOGY OF GRACE.

THE theology which Augustine opposed to the errors of Pelagianism is, briefly, the theology of grace. The roots of this theology were deeply planted in his own experience and the teaching of Scripture, especially in the teaching of that apostle whom he delights to call "the great preacher of grace," and to follow hard after whom was his great desire. The grace of God in Jesus Christ, conveyed to us by the Holy Spirit and evidenced by the love which He sheds abroad in our hearts, is the centre about which his whole system revolves.¹ As over against the Pelagian exaltation of

¹ For the relation of AUGUSTINE's doctrine of the Church to his doctrine of grace and the primacy of the latter in his thought, see the first two essays in REUTER'S *Augustinische Studien*: "In his later years it was not the idea of the Church as the institute of grace, but

nature, he was never weary of glorifying grace. And this high conception the more naturally became the centre of his soteriology because of its harmony with the primal principle of his whole thinking, which was theocentric and grew out of his idea of God as the immanent and vitalizing spirit in whom all things live, and move, and have their being.¹ That God is the absolute good, and nothing is good but God and what comes from Him, so that only as God makes them good may men do good, was the foundation-stone of all his theology. His doctrine of grace appears as but a specific application of this broad doctrine.

The necessity of grace Augustine argued from the condition of the race as sharers in Adam's sin. God created man upright and endowed him with human faculties, including free will;² and gave to him freely that grace by which he was able to retain his uprightness.³ Being thus put on probation,⁴ with divine aid to enable him to stand if he chose, Adam perversely used his free choice for sinning, and involved his whole race in his fall. It was on account of this sin that he died spiritually and physically; and this double death passes

that of predestinational grace that was the dominating one"; "the doctrine of predestinational grace is the fundamental datum of his religious consciousness; it must be unconditionally maintained, and all else must yield to it" (p. 102). The ecclesiastical element was the traditional element in his teaching; but as THOMASIVS points out (*Dogmengeschichte*, i. 495) both experience and Scripture stood with him above tradition. Accordingly HARNACK tells us truly (*Dogmengeschichte* iii. 87, 89): "No Western theologian before him had so lived in the Scriptures or had drawn so much from the Scriptures as he;" and "as no Church father before him, he brought the practical element into the foreground."

¹ It is inexplicable how Professor ALLEN, in his *Continuity of Christian Thought*, can speak of the Augustinian theology as resting "upon the transcendence of Deity as its controlling principle" (p. 3), which is explained as "a tacit assumption of deism" (p. 171) and as involving a "localization of God as a physical essence in the infinite remoteness." Any tendency to error in Augustine's thought of God lay in precisely the opposite direction. Compare AUBREY MOORE, *Lux Mundi*, p. 83, and LEVI L. PAINE, *The New World*, December, 1895 (iv. 670-673).

² *On Rebuke and Grace*, 27, 28.

³ *Ibid.*, 29, 31, sq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

over from him to us.¹ That all his descendants by ordinary generation are partakers in Adam's guilt and condemnation, Augustine is sure from the teachings of Scripture. This is the fact of original sin, from which no one generated from Adam is free, and from which no one is freed save as regenerated in Christ.² But how we are made partakers of it, he is less certain. Sometimes he speaks as if it came by some mysterious unity of the race, so that we were all personally present in the individual Adam, and thus the whole race was the one man that sinned;³ sometimes he speaks more in the sense of modern realists, as if Adam's sin corrupted the nature, and the nature now corrupts those to whom it is communicated;⁴ sometimes he speaks as if it were due to simple heredity.⁵ More characteristically he speaks as if it depended on the presence of shameful concupiscence in the act of procreation, so that the propagation of guilt depends on the propagation of offspring by means of concupiscence.⁶ However transmitted, it is yet a fact that sin is propagated, and all mankind became sinners in Adam. The result is that we have lost the divine image, though not in such a sense that no lineaments of it remain to us.⁷ And, the sinning soul making the flesh corruptible, our whole nature is corrupted, and we are unable to do anything of ourselves truly good.⁸

This corruption includes, of course, an injury to our will. Augustine, writing for the popular eye, treats this subject in popular language. But it is clear that in his thinking he distinguished between will as a faculty and will in a broader sense. As a mere faculty,

¹ *On the City of God*, xiii. 2, 12, 14; *On the Trinity*, iv. 13.

² *On the Merits and Remission of Sins*, i. 15, and often.

³ *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, iv. 7; *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins*, iii. 14, 15.

⁴ *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, ii. 57; *On the City of God*, xiv. 1.

⁵ *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, iv. 7.

⁶ *On Original Sin*, 42; *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, ii. 15.

⁷ *Retractions*, ii. 24.

⁸ *Against Julian*, iv. 3, 25, 26. Compare THOMASIVS' *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 501 and 507.

will is and always remains an indifferent thing.¹ After the fall, as before, it continues poised in indifferency, and ready, like a weathercock, to be turned whithersoever the breeze that blows from the heart ("will," in the broader sense) may direct.² It is not the faculty of willing, but the man who makes use of that faculty, that has suffered change from the fall. In paradise man stood in full ability. He had the *posse non peccare*, but not yet the *non posse peccare*;³ that is, he was endowed with a capacity for either part, and possessed the grace of God by which he was able to stand if he would, but also the power of free will by which he might fall if he would. By his fall he has suffered a change, is become corrupt, and has fallen under the power of Satan. His will (in the broader sense) is now injured, wounded, diseased, enslaved—although the faculty of will (in the narrow sense) remains indifferent. Augustine's criticism of Pelagius' discrimination⁴ of "capacity" (*possibilitas, posse*), "will" (*voluntas, velle*) and "act" (*actio, esse*), does not turn on the discrimination itself, but on the incongruity of placing the *power, ability* in the mere capacity or possibility, rather than in the living agent who "wills" and "acts." He himself adopts an essentially similar distribution, with only this correction.⁵ He thus keeps the faculty of will indifferent, but places the power of using it in the active agent, man. According, then, to the character of the *man*, will the use of the free will be. If the man be holy he will make a holy use of it, and if he be corrupt he will make a sinful use of it: if he be essentially holy, he (like God Himself) cannot make a sinful use of his will; and if he be enslaved to sin, he cannot make a good use of it. The last is the present condition of men by nature. They have free will;⁶ the faculty by which they act remains in in-

¹ *On the Spirit and Letter*, 58.

² *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins*, ii. 30.

³ *On Rebuke and Grace*, 11.

⁴ *On the Grace of Christ*, 4 sq.

⁵ *On the Predestination of the Saints*, 10.

⁶ *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, i. 5; *Epistle* 215, 4 and often.

difference, and they are allowed to use it just as they choose. But such as they cannot desire and therefore cannot choose anything but evil ;¹ and therefore they, and therefore their choice, and therefore their willing, is always evil and never good. They are thus the slaves of sin, which they obey ; and while their free will avails for sinning, it does not avail for doing any good unless they be first freed by the grace of God. The superior depth of Augustine's view and its essential harmony with fact are apparent ; if "the will" be conceived as simply the whole man in the attitude of willing, it would seem to be immediately evident that, however abstractly free the "will" is, it is conditioned in all its action by the character of the willing agent : a bad man does not cease to be bad in the act of willing, and a good man remains good even in his acts of choice.

In its *nature*, grace is assistance, help from God ; and all divine aid may be included under the term—as well what may be called natural as what may be called spiritual aid.² Spiritual grace includes, no doubt, all external help that God gives man for working out his salvation, such as the law, the preaching of the gospel, the example of Christ, by which we may learn the right way. It includes also forgiveness of sins, by which we are freed from the guilt already incurred. But above all it includes that help which God gives by His Holy Spirit, working within, not without, by which man is enabled to choose and to do what he is enabled by the teachings of the law, or by the gospel, or by the natural conscience, to see to be right.³ In this grace are included all those spiritual exercises which we call regeneration, justification, perseverance to the end—in a word, all the divine assistance by which, in being made Christians, we are made to differ from other men. Augustine is fond of representing this grace as in essence the writing of God's law (or God's

¹ *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, i. 7 ; compare i. 5, 6.

² *Sermon*, 26.

³ *On Nature and Grace*, 62 ; *On the Grace of Christ*, 13 ; *On Rebuke and Grace*, 2 sq.

will) on our hearts, so that it appears hereafter as our own desire and wish. Even more prevalently he speaks of it as the shedding abroad of love in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given to us in Christ Jesus. It is, therefore, conceived by him as a change of disposition, by which we come to love and freely choose, in co operation with God's aid, just the things which hitherto we have been unable to choose because of our bondage to sin. Grace, thus, does not make void free will.¹ It operates through free will, and acts upon it only by liberating it from its bondage to sin—*i.e.*, by liberating the agent that uses the free will, so that he is no longer enslaved by his fleshly lusts and is enabled to make use of his free will in choosing the good. Thus it is only by grace that free will is enabled to act in good part.

But just because grace changes the disposition, and so enables man, hitherto enslaved to sin, for the first time to desire and use his free will for good, it lies in the very nature of the case that it is *prevenient*.² Also, as the very name imports, it is necessarily *gratuitous*; ³ since man is enslaved to sin until it is given, all the merits that he can have prior to it are bad merits and deserve punishment, not gifts of favour. When, then, it is asked, *on the ground of what* grace is given, it can only be answered, "on the ground of God's infinite mercy and undeserved favour."⁴ There is nothing in man to merit it, and it first gives merit of good to man. All men alike deserve death, and all that comes to them in the way of blessing is necessarily of God's free and unmerited favour. This is equally true of all grace. It is pre-eminently clear of that grace which gives faith, which is the root of all other graces, and which is given of God, not to merits of good-will or incipient turning to Him, but of His sovereign good pleasure.⁵ But equally with faith, it is true of all other divine gifts.

¹ *On the Spirit and Letter*, 52; *On Grace and Free Will*, 1 sq.

² *On the Spirit and Letter*, 60, and often.

³ *On Nature and Grace*, 4, and often.

⁴ *On the Grace of Christ*, 27, and often.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 34, and often.

We may, indeed, speak of "merits of good" as succeeding faith; but as all these merits find their root in faith, they are but "grace on grace," and men need God's mercy always, throughout this life, and even on the judgment day itself, when, if they are judged without mercy, they must be condemned.¹ If we ask, then, why God gives grace, we can only answer that it is of His unspeakable mercy. And if we ask why He gives it to one rather than to another, what can we answer but that it is of His will? The *sovereignty* of grace results from its very gratuitousness:² where none deserve it, it can be given only of the sovereign good pleasure of the great Giver—and this is necessarily inscrutable, but cannot be unjust. We can faintly perceive, indeed, some reasons why God may be supposed not to have chosen to give His saving grace to all,³ or even to the most.⁴ But we cannot understand why He has chosen to give it to just the individuals to whom He has given it, and to withhold it from just those from whom He has withheld it. Here we are driven to the apostle's cry, "O the depth of the riches both of the mercy and the justice of God!"⁵

The *effects of grace* are according to its nature. Taken as a whole, it is the recreative principle sent forth from God for the recovery of man from his slavery to sin, and for his reformation in the divine image. Considered as to the time of its giving, it is either *operating* or *co-operating*⁶ grace, *i.e.*, either the grace that first enables the will to choose the good, or the grace that co-operates with the already enabled will to do the good. It is, therefore, also called either *prevenient* or *subsequent* grace.⁷ It is not to be conceived as a series of disconnected divine gifts, but as a constant efflux from

¹ *On Grace and Free Will*, 21.

² *Ibid.*, 30, and often.

³ *On the Gift of Perseverance*, 16; *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, ii. 15.

⁴ *Epistle to Optatus*, 190.

⁵ *On the Predestination of the Saints*, 17, 18.

⁶ *On Grace and Free Will*, 33, and often.

⁷ *On Grace and Free Will*, 17; *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*, 34, and often.

God. But we may look upon it in the various steps of its operation in men, as bringing forgiveness of sins, faith, which is the beginning of all good, love to God, progressive power of good working, and perseverance to the end.¹ In any case, and in all its operations alike, just because it is power from on high and the living spring of a new and re-created life, it is *irresistible* and *indefectible*.² Those on whom the Lord bestows the gift of faith, working from within, not from without, of course have faith and cannot help believing. Those to whom perseverance to the end is given will assuredly persevere to the end. It is not to be objected to this that many seem to begin well who do not persevere. This also is of God, who has in such cases given great blessings indeed, but not *this* blessing of perseverance to the end. Whatever of good men have, that God has given. And what they have not, why, of course God has not given it. Nor can it be objected that this leaves all uncertain. It is only unknown to us; but this does not argue uncertainty. We cannot know that we are to have any gift which God sovereignly gives, of course, until it is given; and we therefore cannot know that we have perseverance unto the end until we actually persevere to the end.³ But who would call what God does and knows He is to do uncertain, and what man is to do certain? Nor will it do to say that thus nothing is left for us to do. No doubt, all things are in God's hands, and we should praise God that this is so, but we must co-operate with Him; and it is just because it is He that is working in us the willing and the doing, that it is worth our while to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. God has not determined the end without determining the appointed means.⁴

Now, Augustine argues, since grace certainly is gratuitous and given to no preceding merits—pre-

¹ Compare THOMASIIUS' *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 510.

² *On Rebuke and Grace*, 40, 45; *On the Predestination of the Saints*, 13.

³ *On Rebuke and Grace*, 40.

⁴ *On the Gift of Perseverance*, 56.

venient and antecedent to all good—and, therefore, sovereign and bestowed only on those whom God selects for its reception—we must, of course, believe that the eternal God has foreknown all this from the beginning. He would be something less than God, had He not foreknown that He intended to bestow this prevenient, gratuitous and sovereign grace on some men, and had He not foreknown equally the precise individuals on whom He intended to bestow it. To foreknow is to prepare beforehand. And this is *predestination*.¹ He argues that there can be no objection to predestination, in itself considered, in the mind of any man who believes in God. What men object to is gratuitous and sovereign grace, and to this no additional difficulty is added by the necessary assumption that it was foreknown and prepared for from eternity. That predestination does not proceed on the foreknowledge of good or of faith,² follows from its being nothing more than the foresight and preparation of grace, which, in its very idea, is gratuitous and not according to any merits, sovereign and according only to God's purpose, prevenient and in order to faith and good works. It is the sovereignty of grace, not its foresight or the preparation for it, which places men in God's hands and suspends salvation absolutely on His unmerited mercy. But just because God is God, of course no one receives grace who has not been foreknown and afore-selected for the gift; and, as much of course, no one who has been foreknown and afore-selected for it, fails to receive it. Therefore the number of the predestinated is fixed, and fixed by God.³ Is this fate? Men may call God's grace fate if they choose; but it is not fate, but undeserved love and tender mercy, without which none would be saved.⁴ Does it paralyze effort? Only to those who will not strive to obey God because obedience is His gift. Is

¹ *On the Predestination of the Saints*, 36 sq.

² *On the Gift of Perseverance*, 41 sq., 47.

³ *On Rebuke and Grace*, 39; compare 14.

⁴ *On the Gift of Perseverance*, 29; *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, ii. 9 sq.

it unjust? Far from it: shall not God do what He will with His own undeserved favour? It is nothing but gratuitous mercy, sovereignly distributed, and foreseen and provided for from all eternity by Him who has selected us in His Son.

Augustine's doctrine of *the means of grace, i.e.*, of the channels and circumstances of the conference of grace upon men, is the meeting point of two very dissimilar streams of thought—his doctrine of grace and his doctrine of the Church. Profound thinker as he was, within whose active mind was born an incredible multitude of the richest conceptions, he was not primarily a systematiser, and these divergent streams of thought rather conditioned each the purity of the other's development at this point than were thoroughly harmonized.¹ He does not, indeed, bind the conference of grace to the means in such a sense that the grace must be given at the exact time of the application of the means. He does not deny that "God is able, even when no man rebukes, to correct whom He will, and to lead him on to the wholesome mortification of repentance by the most hidden and most mighty power of His medicine."² Though the Gospel must be known in order that man may be saved³ (for how shall they believe without a preacher?), yet the preacher is nothing and the preaching is nothing, but God only that gives the increase.⁴ He even has something like a distant glimpse of what has since been called the distinction between the visible and invisible Church. He speaks of men not yet born as among those who are "called according to God's purpose" and therefore of the saved who constitute

¹ Says HARNACK (*Dogmengeschichte*, iii. 90): "In conflict with Manicheanism and Donatism, Augustine acquired a doctrine of freedom, of the Church and of the means of grace which has little in common with his experience of sin and grace, and is in open strife with the theological development of this experience (doctrine of predestinational grace). It is possible even to draw out a double theology of Augustine, an Ecclesiastics and a Doctrine of Grace, and to present the whole in both."

² *On Rebuke and Grace*, i.

³ *On the Predestination of the Saints*, 17, 18; if the gospel is not preached at any given place, it is proof that God has no elect there.

⁴ *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins*, etc., ii. 37.

the Church,¹ and asserts that those who are so called, even before they believe, are "already children of God, enrolled in the memorial of their Father with unchangeable surety."² At the same time, he allows that there are many already in the visible Church who are not of it, and who can therefore depart from it. But he teaches that those who are thus lost out of the visible Church are lost because of some fatal flaw in their baptism, or on account of post-baptismal sins; and that those who are of the "called according to the purpose" are predestinated not only to salvation, but to salvation by baptism. Grace is not tied to the means in the sense that it is not conferred save in the means; but it is tied to the means in the sense that it is not conferred without the means. Baptism, for instance, is absolutely necessary for salvation: no exception is allowed except such as save the principle—baptism of blood (martyrdom),³ and, somewhat grudgingly, baptism of intention. And baptism, when worthily received, is absolutely efficacious: "if a man were to die immediately after baptism, he would have nothing at all left to hold him liable to punishment."⁴ In a word, while there are many baptized who will not be saved, there are none saved who have not been or are not to be baptized; it is the grace of God that saves, but baptism is a channel of grace without which none actually receive it.⁵

One of the corollaries that flowed from this doctrine was that by which Augustine was led to assert that all those who died unbaptized, including infants, are finally lost and depart into eternal punishment. He did not shrink from the inference, although he assigned the place of lightest punishment in hell to those who were guilty of no sin but original sin, but who had departed this life without having washed this away in the

¹ *On Rebuke and Grace*, 23.

² *Ibid.*, 20.

³ *On the Soul and its Origin*, i. 11; ii. 17.

⁴ *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins*, etc., ii. 46.

⁵ On Augustine's teaching as to baptism, see Rev. JAMES FIELD SPALDING'S *The Teaching and Influence of Augustine*, pp. 39 sq.

"laver of regeneration." This is the dark side of his soteriology. But it should be remembered that it was not his theology of grace, but the universal and traditional belief in the necessity of baptism for remission of sins, which he inherited in common with all of his time, that forced it upon him. The theology of grace was destined in the hands of his successors, who have rejoiced to confess that they were taught by him, to remove this stumbling-block also from Christian teaching; and if not to Augustine, it is to Augustine's theology that the Christian world owes its liberation from so terrible a tenet. Along with the doctrine of the damnation of all unbaptized infants, another stumbling-block also, not so much of Augustinian as of the Church theology inherited by Augustine, has gone. It was not because of his theology of grace or of his doctrine of predestination, that Augustine taught that comparatively few of the human race are saved. It was, again, because as a good churchman of his day he believed that baptism and incorporation into the visible Church were necessary for salvation. And it is only because of Augustine's theology of grace, which places man in the hands of an all-merciful Saviour and not in the grasp of a human institution, that men have come to see that in the salvation of all who die in infancy, the invisible Church of God embraces the vast majority of the human race—saved not by the washing of water administered by the Church, but by the blood of Christ administered by God's own hand outside of the ordinary channels of His grace.¹ We are indeed born in sin, and those that die in infancy are, in Adam, children of wrath even as others; but God's hand is not shortened by the limits of His Church on earth, that it cannot save.

Despite the strong churchly element within the theology of Augustine, the development of which has produced the ecclesiasticism of Romish thought, it must be admitted that, on the side that is presented in the con-

¹ This is shown in the author's essay on *The Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation*, in "*Christian Literature*," 1891.

troversy against Pelagianism, it is in its essence distinctly anti-ecclesiastical. Its central thought was the immediate dependence of the individual on the grace of God in Jesus Christ. It made everything that concerned salvation to be of God, and traced the source of all good to Him. "Without me ye can do nothing," is the inscription on one side of it; on the other stands written, "All things are yours." Augustine held that he who builds on a human foundation builds on sand, and founded all his hope on the Rock itself. And there also he founded his teaching; as he distrusted man in the matter of salvation, so he distrusted him in the form of theology. No other of the fathers so conscientiously wrought out his theology from the revealed Word; no other of them so sternly excluded human additions. The subjects of which theology treats, he declares, are such as "we could by no means find out unless we believed them on the testimony of Holy Scripture."¹ "Where Scripture gives no certain testimony," he says, "human presumption must beware how it decides in favor of either side."² "We must first bend our necks to the authority of Scripture," he insists, "in order that we may arrive at knowledge and understanding through faith."³ And this was not merely his theory, but his practice.⁴ No theology was ever, it may be more broadly asserted, more conscientiously wrought out from the Scriptures than that which he opposed to the Pelagians. It is not without its shortcomings. But its errors are on the surface and not of its essence. It came from God, and it leads to God; and in the midst of the controversies of so many ages it has shown itself an edifice whose solid core is built out of material "which cannot be shaken."

¹ *On the Soul and its Origin*, iv. 14.

² *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins*, etc., ii. 59.

³ *Ibid.*, i. 29.

⁴ Compare *On the Spirit and the Letter*, 63.

THE INFLUENCE OF MACHIAVELLI ON
THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

BY W. ALISON PHILLIPS.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), December, 1896.

IN the widespread and immediate influence which they exercised probably no political writings have ever equalled those of Machiavelli. Not that he was the creator of that unscrupulous statecraft with which his name has been for centuries associated ; for Machiavellism (to risk the appearance of paradox) existed before Machiavelli, and he did no more than codify and comment on those principles of policy which he saw applied everywhere about him. But, in doing this, he undoubtedly gave a great impetus to their use, his treatise *The Prince* forming a convenient text-book of practical politics, of which European statesmen were not slow to take advantage. Multiplied in numerous editions, this work, with its companion volume, the *Discourses on Livy*, in spite of the loud and horrified denunciations of old-fashioned moralists, soon found its way into every cabinet and council chamber of Europe, and its cynical maxims have left their impress only too clearly on the policies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

It may, then, in the light of recent events, be not without interest to inquire how far English statesmen of the Reformation period were brought under the sinister influence of Machiavelli's genius, and, more especially, to attempt some estimate of its effect upon their ecclesiastical policy.

At the outset of such an inquiry we are confronted with one striking and significant characteristic of the English Reformation, differentiating it from contemporary movements in other countries—a certain vagueness of outline, by no means altogether due to the obscuring effect of distance, which makes it difficult to arrive at any universally acceptable definition of its principles and aims. As to what happened in Scot-

land, in Holland, or in Geneva, there can be no controversy. In all of these the revolution was abrupt and thorough, constituting a more or less complete breach with the past ; and even in Lutheran Germany and Scandinavia the retention of a large body of Catholic doctrine and ceremonial was far outweighed by the conscious and deliberate breach of the 'Apostolic Succession.' In England, on the other hand, the movement was from the first largely conservative, avoiding revolutionary methods, intolerant of extremes, advancing cautiously step by step, and careful of all the ties that bound it to the past, so long as these were consistent with the aim of its political leaders—the subservience of the Church to the State.

This striking characteristic of the Reformation in England may have been due to the exigencies of the case, and to the natural tendency of Englishmen to change the spirit rather than the form of their institutions ; but it is nevertheless so entirely in accord with Machiavelli's principle that, in making innovations, the substance rather than the form should be changed, that, in so far as it was the result of deliberate policy, it may well have been to some extent inspired by him, more especially as there is abundant proof of his influence on the methods by which the revolution was effected.

That Henry the Eighth was himself directly influenced by any study of *The Prince* may be doubted, though he was himself a typical prince of the Renaissance—in his culture, his learning, his splendour, and his popular manners, no less than in his 'cruelty well applied.' Yet he was not the ideal ruler of Machiavelli, for he succumbed to that all but universal failing of not knowing how to be wholly either good or bad. 'He was,' to use the words of the late Professor Froude, 'divided against himself. Nine days in ten he was the clear-headed, energetic, powerful statesman ; on the tenth he was looking wistfully to the superstition which he had left.' In short, he still nursed his theological conscience, and had not yet learned from Machiavelli to regard religion solely as the hand-

maid of politics. In Thomas Cromwell, however, he found a minister to whom his objects were thoroughly congenial, and whose methods were less likely to be affected by inconvenient scruples.

That Cromwell's ecclesiastical policy was dictated by motives of zeal for Evangelical religion, or sympathy with persecuted truth, is a view which may appeal to some minds ; but, in the light of available evidence, it is far more probable that the reforming tendencies of the day were merely used by him, in the true Machiavellian spirit, to further the object which he consistently kept in view—the consolidation of an absolute royal power, under the forms of a constitution, by the aid of a subservient parliament and a terrorised Church. Nor, in spite of the scarcely impartial opinion of the late Professor Froude,¹ is it improbable that this policy was deliberately based upon Machiavelli's teaching. It is admitted that Cromwell spent many years in Italy, first as a clerk in a commercial house in Florence, and afterwards as a soldier of fortune or engaged in diplomatic service at various Italian Courts. It is not surprising that a politician trained in the school of the Medici and the Borgias should have welcomed the appearance of *The Prince*, or have been content to use its maxims in the architecture of his own fortunes ; and there seems no adequate reason (certainly none is given by Professor Froude) for doubting the substantial truth of the accusation of Machiavellism which is brought against Cromwell by Cardinal Pole.

Pole affirms that the immediate cause of his exile was the rise of Cromwell to power, the results of which he dreaded, because he had had an opportunity of judging of that statesman's principles and maxims of government in a conversation he had once had with him on the office of a prudent councillor. 'In this decision,' he says, 'nothing influenced me more than my having from that one interview and conversation easily perceived what kind of government we should have,

¹ He dismisses Pole's accusation of Machiavellism against Cromwell in a short footnote (*Hist.* vol. ii. ch. vi. p. 109).

if that man ever held the reins of power—namely, a government dangerous and destructive to all honest men.” Of this discussion, which had been raised by some reference to Wolsey, the Cardinal proceeds to give an epitome. ‘I told him,’ he says, ‘that it was the duty of a councillor to consider above all things the interest and honour of his sovereign; and I enlarged on these subjects, as they are enforced by the law of nature and the writings of pious and learned men.’ Cromwell, in reply, poured scorn on the opinions of pious and learned men, as themes good enough for sermons or the discussions of the schools, but of little use in practical politics, and decidedly out of favour at the courts of princes. In his opinion a little experience was worth a great deal of theory, and statesmen who based their policy upon books, rather than upon a knowledge of men and affairs, were apt to suffer shipwreck. For the prudent councillor the first thing to do was to study the prince’s inclinations—by no means an easy task, since the external deportment of princes so often belies their inner character. ‘For it is of the greatest importance that he should in his conversation consistently display an exalted character for religiousness, piety, and the other virtues; without, however, there being the slightest necessity for his inclinations to coincide with it.’ And in this respect the prudent councillor will know how to imitate the prince, a result to be obtained with a very little trouble. The Cardinal was, very naturally, not a little shocked. At this Cromwell expressed no surprise, but told him that, if he were to turn for a while from his studies to the practical affairs of State, he would soon learn the comparative value of experience and theory in the art of government. ‘In these matters,’ he exclaims, ‘a few sentences from a man of experience are worth whole volumes written by a philosopher who has no such experience.’ For him a book founded upon empty speculation had no value. Plato’s *Republic* had been written about two thousand years, and its

¹ Cf. *Apologia ad Carolum V.* An abstract is given by Professor Brewer in his essay on the Royal Supremacy.

maxims had never yet been practically applied. On the other hand, he knew of a book which he would recommend Pole to read, written by a practical man whose rules and maxims were confirmed by everyday experience, 'a book,' adds the horrified Cardinal, 'which, though it displayed the style of a man, I had nevertheless hardly begun to read, when I saw that it had been penned by the finger of Satan.' This Satanic work was, of course, Machiavelli's *Prince*.

Others have, indeed, abundantly pointed out the Machiavellian nature of Cromwell's methods¹—his government by terror, his elaborate system of spies, his ruthless sweeping aside of all who stood in his path. As an illustration of this system of tyranny it may suffice to take one notable instance, closely connected with the Reformation both in its political and religious aspects. The execution of Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher has always been regarded as the master crime of the Cromwellian reign of terror. Even Professor Froude lamented its necessity, though it was, in his opinion, a necessity.² It was, it is true, unfortunate that the affair of the Anne Boleyn marriage 'told fatally to destroy the appearance of probity of motive, so indispensable to the defence of the Government ;' and Europe, no doubt labouring under a misconception of the facts, was filled with indignation. So great, indeed, was this indignation that Henry 'condescended to an explanation.' He directed the magistrates to enlarge to the people on the malicious treasons of the Bishop of Rochester and Sir Thomas More. To the King of France, who had ventured to send a remonstrance, he replied haughtily that 'the English Government had acted on clear proof of treason ; treason so manifest, and tending so clearly to the total destruction of the commonwealth of this realm, that the condemned persons were all well worthy, if they had a thousand lives, to have suffered a ten times more ter-

¹ See Brewer, *Introduction to State Papers*.

² *History*, vol. ii. p. 385, etc. Cf. Machiavelli, *Discorsi*: '... nessuna Repubblica bene ordinata non mai cancellò i demeriti con gli meriti di suoi cittadini.'

rible death and execution than any of them did suffer.' And what were these terrible treasons about which Henry was so righteously indignant, as tending to the total subversion of the realm? More had been willing to recognise the right of Parliament to alter the succession; he had been prepared to keep silence on the royal supremacy. What he had not been willing to do was to perjure himself by denying openly his belief in the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. If this was treason, of every hundred honest men in the kingdom ninety-nine were traitors.

The treasons for which More was condemned had not been on the statute book a year. A few months before his arrest it would have been heresy to affirm what it was now treason to deny. He was not allowed to escape by retiring into private life, as he wished, but was hunted out and, contrary to all precedent and all natural justice, entrapped into incriminating himself. The true reason for their execution Professor Froude himself gives, though it is difficult for an unbiassed mind to see in it any real justification. 'They had,' he says, 'chosen to make themselves conspicuous as confessors of Catholic truth; though prisoners in the Tower, they were in effect the most effectual champions of the Papal claims, and if their disobedience had been passed over the Act could have been enforced against no one.' They were, in fact, those uncompromising and conscientious opponents of the new order whom Machiavelli classes under the name of 'the sons of Brutus,' and who must, in his view, be slain, if the new order is to be maintained.¹

If, then, the influence of Machiavelli is so clearly traceable on Cromwell's political methods, it is possible that, in its broader aspects also, his policy was derived from the same source. Especially may he have learned from Machiavelli that astuteness by which he recognised that men are often willing to surrender the substance of their rights if they are allowed to retain the shadow, which led him to exercise a despotic gov-

¹ *History*, vol. ii. p. 369.

² *Discorsi*, book iii. cap. 4.

ernment without the open violation of any constitutional form, and, finally, to make the Church the seemingly willing instrument of her own enslavement. And the justification of this Machiavellian policy is found in the comparatively peaceful course of the Reformation in England. The great bulk of the people, Catholic by education, by instinct, and by the strong conservatism of our race, accepted the new order without realising to what it committed them. Later on, when the hopes of a reaction became weaker, the discontent of a small minority might express itself in abortive plots; but England was spared the horrors of a Thirty Years' War, or of a struggle such as that between the Huguenots and the League; and when, in the next century, the Puritan Revolution occurred, its motives were political rather than religious. Even in our day this Machiavellian method of reform still bears fruit, in that it can be seriously argued that the Church of England under Henry the Eighth was the willing instrument of her own reformation.

With the fall of Cromwell the influence of Machiavelli on the course of ecclesiastical affairs in England came, for the time, to an end. For his strong and farsighted, if ruthless, policy there was little sympathy found among the crowd of miserable sycophants who rose upon his ruin, who surrounded the throne during the last years of Henry the Eighth, and held the reins of power under Edward. With Cromwell, as with Machiavelli, the Dudleys, the Seymours, and the Riches had nothing in common, save their unscrupulousness. All grandeur of aim is gone; and for the great policy of Cromwell they substituted the most sordid of private motives, striving by the same unscrupulous means which he had used for public ends to gratify their personal ambition or avarice. It would be a libel on Machiavelli to apply his name to this government of incompetent and selfish factions. It would have been well had they studied *The Prince*, and taken its lessons to heart; if Somerset had learned from it to avoid the vacillation and want of decision which characterised him, to abstain from hasty and ill-

considered innovations in religion, and to recognise that the true strength of a government lies in the goodwill of the people. But the strong policy of Cromwell, in fact, ceased with his death, and it was not until England had been for eleven years, under Edward and Mary, a prey to the misgovernment of unscrupulous adventurers, and doctrinaires, Catholic and Protestant, that the system which he had initiated was revived again by the accession of Elizabeth.

During the reign of Elizabeth, even more than during that of Henry the Eighth, the statecraft of Machiavelli seems to have been consistently applied. The conditions obtaining in England at the time of the Queen's accession were, indeed, not altogether unlike those which had prompted Machiavelli to write his *Discourses*. There was the same danger to be feared both from within and from without—within, the never-ceasing war of religious factions, wasting in futile and bloody controversy the best strength of the nation; without 'the French king bestriding the realm, having one foot in Calais and the other in Scotland; steadfast enemies, but no steadfast friends.' In both the *Discourses on Livy* and *The Prince*, whatever differences of principle and method there might be between them, Machiavelli had the same object in view—the healing of the open wounds of Italy and her liberation from the hated bondage of the 'barbarian.' This, with the necessary differences of circumstance, was also the task that lay before Elizabeth. How well she performed it is matter of history and need not be enlarged upon here.¹ We are more concerned with the policy she pursued, and by means of which she raised England, menaced at her accession by the hostility of France and the scarcely less dangerous friendship of Spain, to an unprecedented height of glory and influence among the nations of Europe. This policy, deliberately selected among several alternatives, was as

¹ Address to the Council. Cf. Froude, *Hist.* vol. vii. p. 8.

² See Bacon's account of the state of England at the time of the Queen's death in 'Observations on a Libel,' etc. (*Works*, vol. iii. p. 40, ed. 1824, London).

novel as it was successful. How far was it inspired by the writings of Machiavelli?

There is evidence, which I will adduce later on, to prove that Machiavelli's works were studied by at least one of Elizabeth's advisers. But the Queen was apt to follow her own courses, and it is certain that no policy could have been forced upon her against her own judgment. The brilliant results of her long and glorious reign were, in fact, due to her own genius. For, though she knew how to select and keep her ministers, her relations with them were always regulated on the principles that Machiavelli had laid down ;¹ and, while she was ever ready to listen to any advice they had to offer, she never allowed her share of the government to be overshadowed by their influence. Even Lord Burleigh, who for thirty-four years continued to enjoy her confidence, was in the habit of deferring to her opinion, and, as Bacon says, 'there never was a councillor of his Lordship's long continuance that was so applicable to Her Majesty's princely resolutions, endeavouring always, after faithful propositions and remonstrances, and these in the best words and the most grateful manner, to rest upon such conclusions as Her Majesty in her own wisdom determineth, and them to execute to the best.'² The guiding spirit of Elizabeth's policy, then, is to be sought in the character of the Queen herself, whose personality exercised so extraordinary an influence in directing the tendency of affairs during her reign.

In some respects Elizabeth approached nearer than her father to Machiavelli's ideal prince. The salient characteristics of Henry the Eighth were, indeed, renewed in her ; but whereas he had never quite succeeded in burying the theologian in the statesman, his daughter followed Machiavelli in regarding religion mainly as subsidiary to statecraft, not hesitating, as it seemed, to do violence to her own convictions or predilections if by so doing she could further her policy. That her action was consciously based on a study of

¹ 'Observations on a Libel,' etc. (Bacon, vol. iii. p. 40).

² Cf. *The Prince*, cap. xxiii.

The Prince there seems, indeed, to be no evidence to prove ; but there is much to make us suspect that she was not unacquainted with Machiavelli's writings. There is a certain theatrical aspect about both her private and public life, which seems to show that she was acting a carefully studied part ; and all the intricacies of her policy appear to have been based upon some consistent theory of statecraft. From Machiavelli it may have been that she borrowed that art of political lying which she carried to the verge of comedy, and which she seemed to regard as part of the essential equipment of every diplomatist.¹ And, if she was proud of her skill in outwitting others, she was even more so of the penetration which enabled her to see through their deceits. 'You deal not,' she writes to James the Sixth, upbraiding him with breaking his word, 'you deal not with one whose experience can take dross for good payments, nor one that easily may be beguiled. No, no ! I mind to set to school your craftiest councillor.' Nor was this high opinion of her own powers without foundation. Bacon comments on 'her penetrating sight in discovering every man's ends and drifts ; her inventing wit in contriving plots and overturns ; her foreseeing events ; her usage of occasions.'² And if, in these matters, she appeared in a large measure to realise Machiavelli's conception of a prudent prince, she did so no less in the broad outlines of her policy.

The great problem which, at the beginning of her reign, Elizabeth was called on to solve was the question of religion ; and it is in her religious policy that the influence of Machiavelli may be most clearly traced. The crisis of the religious revolution had, indeed, already passed when she came to the throne. A few zealots, on one side or the other, might be still anxious

¹ Theodor Mundt (*Machiavelli u. der Gang der europäischen Politik*) points out the dramatic aspect of *The Prince* : 'It is more the question of the study of a part than of a consistent doctrine.'

² Cf. *Prince*, cap. xviii.

³ Cf. Ellis, *Original Letters*, vol. i. letter ccxv.

⁴ 'A Discourse in Praise of Queen Elizabeth,' Bacon's *Works*, vol. iii. p. 35 (London, 1824).

to fight out the battle to a decisive conclusion, but the nation as a whole was heartily weary of a theological warfare which had reduced the country to the verge of ruin. The accession of the new queen had brought back streams of Protestant refugees, breathing vengeance and destruction against their persecutors, whilst Elizabeth's cautious proceedings during the first few months of her reign had, for the time, revived the hopes of the Catholics. But she had, in fact, determined to favour neither of the extreme parties. She knew that in following this course she would have the support of the bulk of the nation, and, with the mass of the nation on her side, she could afford to brave the attacks of the small number, however zealous they might be, who would be hostile to her system. Religion, then, was to be no longer the chief motive of government. Henceforward the attention of the people was to be drawn away from the fatal animosities of theology by the substitution of a new motive for their aspiration, a motive to which religion was to be subservient; and the nation, hitherto shattered by the conflict of rival sects, was to be welded together in a common opposition to the power and arrogance of Spain.

At the beginning of the reign, indeed, Philip had still hoped to retain his hold on England, and had offered Elizabeth his alliance. For a moment she hesitated, as well she might, for, situated as she was, the offer was a dazzling one. But she had had the strength and foresight to refuse it. And the policy which she pursued instead was that which Machiavelli had recommended for distracted Italy—namely, the policy of 'military reorganisation,'¹ or the consolidation of the people by uniting them in a national conflict with a rival Power. And just as in Machiavelli the religious motive is made entirely subservient to the political, so the national religion became during Elizabeth's reign gradually associated in the minds of the people with the national opposition to Spain. Recusancy, which

¹ 'Politik der kriegerischen Reorganisation' (cf. Theodor Mundt, *Machiavelli und der Gang der europäischen Politik*).

under Edward the Sixth would have been punished as heresy rather than treason, came to be regarded as an offence against the national cause rather than as a religious crime. Elizabeth, in fact, cared little about abstract propositions of theology. She was quite content to renounce her father's title of 'Supreme Head of the Church,' if by so doing she could persuade people to acquiesce more readily in her practical supremacy. She had no desire to 'pry into men's consciences,' but she required that every man should bow to the laws which she had made in the interests of the national unity. And the success of this policy is apparent in the religious tranquillity of the earlier part of her reign, a tranquillity which might have been permanent, had not the bulls of Pius the Fifth blown the smouldering embers of religious zeal once more into a flame; and, even then, the failure of the Catholic plots proves the general soundness of the Queen's policy.

If Elizabeth did not derive her principles and method of government directly from Machiavelli, it is more than probable that they were suggested to her by the most trusted of her ministers, who, without doubt, had studied him to good purpose.

There is, in the library of the British Museum, a volume containing copies of Machiavelli's *Prince* and the *Discourses on Livy* bound up together. These were ostensibly published at Palermo, in 1584, but are judged, from the evidence of certain initial woodcuts, to have been actually printed clandestinely in London by one John Wolfe. On the title-page of this volume, which is elaborately underlined and annotated throughout, is the signature 'W. Cecil.' To attempt to prove that it was Lord Burleigh who owned and annotated this book is tempting; but unhappily honesty compels me to admit that the handwriting is not his, and that in any case at the date of the publication of the volume his signature would have been 'W. Burleigh.' Yet the name of Cecil, in such a connection, is not without significance, and it would have been possible to argue from it, with some plausibility, that Machiavelli's treatises were known to Lord Burleigh. Fortunately,

however, there is other and more conclusive evidence to prove the same point.

Burleigh was in the habit, from time to time, of reducing the outlines of any course of policy he advocated to writing, as memorials for the Queen's use. Of these memorials several have been published among his papers, and serve to throw no little light on the character of his policy ; one of them being of peculiar value, because it not only proves that Burleigh himself was a disciple of Machiavelli, but enables us to form some estimate of how far Elizabeth's religious policy was directly influenced by the Florentine writer. This document is published under the title of 'Advice of the Lord Treasurer Burleigh to Queen Elizabeth in Matters of Religion and State,' and the most important part of it deals with the question of the Catholic malcontents. With regard to these there were two courses open to the Queen. She might either allow them to grow strong, in the hope of making them contented, or discontent them by making them weaker, 'for what the mixture of strength and discontent engenders needs no syllogism to prove.' But to suffer them to be strong in the hope of making them contented carried with it, in his opinion, 'but a fair enamelling of a terrible danger ;' 'for men's natures are apt to strive not only against the present smart, but to revenging by past injury, though they be never so well contented thereafter.' For on the very first opportunity for revenge that presents itself 'they will remember not the after slacking but the former binding, and so much the more when they shall imagine this relenting to proceed from fear ; for it is the poison of all government when the subject thinks the prince doth anything more out of fear than favour.' But, above all, there should be no half-measures ; 'for 'no

¹ Fourth collection of *Somers Tracts*, vol. i. p. 101.

² *Discorsi*, book iii. p. 4 : 'Mai l' ingiurie vecchie non furono cancellate da beneficii nuovi.' Also *Principe*, cap. vii. end.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 14 ; also *Principe*, end of chap. viii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 23 : 'Ne usarno mai la via neutrale in quelli di momento.'

man loves one the better for giving him the bastinado, though with never so little a cudgel ; ' the course of the most wise, most politick, and best grounded estates hath ever been to make an assuredness of friendship, or to take away all power of enmity.' ' Yet here,' he adds, ' I must distinguish between discontent and despair ; for it sufficeth to weaken the discontented, but there is no way to kill desperates, which in such number as they are, were as hard and difficult as impious and ungodly ; and, therefore, though they must be discontented, I would not have them desperate ; for amongst many desperate men it is like that some one will bring forth some desperate deed.' "

A comparison with *The Prince* or the *Discourses on Livy* will show that not only the spirit of the above advice, but in some cases almost the language in which it is couched, is borrowed from Machiavelli. And if the conclusion to which Burleigh is led by the above argument is a just one—namely, that the consciences of the Catholics should not be forced by compelling them to take an oath contrary to their belief in the Papal supremacy—he arrives at this conclusion not because it is wrong to force men's consciences, but because, in this case, it would be dangerous to the State to do so ; and, in dealing out any scant measure of justice to the malcontents, in his opinion ' the furthest point to be sought was but to avoid their despair.' ' The knot of this discourse is,' he concludes, ' that if your Majesty find it convenient, on the one side by relenting the rigour of the oath, and on the other side by disabling your unsound subjects, you shall neither execute any but very traitors in all men's opinions and constructions, nor yet put faith in any but those who ever, for their own sakes, must be faithful.'

It was the carrying out of this policy that enabled

¹ *Discorsi*, vol. ii. p. 23 : ' Quel principe, che non castiga chi erra, in modo che non possa più errare, è tenuto o ignorante o vile.'

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 28 : ' Notabile a qualunque governa, che mai non debba tanto poco stimare un' huomo, che e' creda . . . che colui, che è ingiuriato, non si pensi di vendicarsi con ogni suo pericolo e particular danno.'

the apologists of Elizabeth's administration, Burleigh himself, Walsingham, and Bacon, to vindicate her conduct towards the Catholics by alleging that they were punished, not for conscience sake, but for treason. Yet, however strenuously they might deny that consciences were forced, however frequently they might reiterate that the Government was merely punishing those cases of conscience which had changed their character by exceeding all bounds, and become matters of faction, the fact remained that the limits of conscientious scruple had been arbitrarily fixed by themselves, and that it was their own policy of making religion an instrument for the attainment of political ends which had rendered persecution a State necessity. And through the thin disguise of all their arguments in justification of their repressive policy appears the fact that they themselves were half conscious that their real motive and true justification was the Machiavellian doctrine that all means are permissible that conduce to the well-being of the State.

Machiavellian in its details, the ecclesiastical policy of Elizabeth was, like that of Cromwell, Machiavellian also in its broader aspects. The ecclesiastical settlement under Elizabeth constituted in effect a complete revolution in the religious character of the nation. At her accession the Queen had found the nation, for the most part, Catholic; when she died it was fiercely and unalterably Protestant. And yet of this tremendous change, so skilfully veiled had been the processes, and so carefully conservative the methods, that it was possible for the Government to assert, and to assert with some plausibility, that in the polity of the Church no fundamentally new principles had been introduced. 'In this part (*i.e.* in the religious innovations),' runs a proclamation of Queen Elizabeth,

we know of no other authority, either given or used by us, as Quene and Governor of this Realm, than hath ben by the Lawe of God and this Realm alwayes due to our Progenitors, Soverayns, and Kinges of the same; although true it is that this Authority hath ben in the Tyme of certain of our Progenitors, some hundred years past, as by Lawes, Records, and Storyes doth appere (and specially in the Reign of our noble Father Henry the Eighth and our deare Brother Edward the

Sixth) more clearly recognized by all the Estates of the Realme, as the like hath ben in our Tyme; without that thereby we do either challenge or take to us (as malicious Parsons do untruly surmise) any Superiority to ourself to defyne, decyde, or determyn any Article or Poynt of the Chrestian Fayth and Relligion, or to chang any ancient Ceremony of the Church from the Forme before received and observed by the Catholick and Apostolick Church, or the Use of any Function belongyng to any ecclesiastical Person being a Minister of the Word and Sacraments of the Church: But that Authority which is yelded to us and our Crown consisteth in this; that, considering we are by God's Grace the Soverayn Prince and Quene, next under God, and all the People of our Realm are immediately born Subjects to us and to none ells, and that our Realme hath of long time time past received the Christian Fayth, we are by this Authorite bound to direct all Estates, being subject to us, to live in the Fayth and Obedience of Christian Relligion, and to see the Lawes of God and Man, which are ordained to that end, to be duly observed, and the Offenders against the same duly punished, and consequently to provide that the Church may be governed and taught by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and Ministers accordyng to the ecclesiastical Auncient Pollycy of the Realme, whom we do assist with our soverayn Power . . .¹

So the clergy are still, according to Elizabeth, supreme in all spiritual matters; her own function is confined to bringing, as a dutiful daughter of the Catholic Church, the secular power to the aid of religion! Can this be the same voice that threatened to 'unfrock' a certain 'proud prelate' because he tried to defend the property of his see?

'Whoever desires to introduce reforms into a State,' Machiavelli had written, 'in such manner as to have them accepted, and maintained to everybody's satisfaction, must retain at least the shadow of old institutions, so as to appear to have altered nothing, while in fact the new arrangements are entirely different from the old.'

¹ 'A Declaration of the Queen's Proceedings since her Reign,' published among the *Burleigh Papers*, Haynes, p. 591. This proclamation was issued early in 1570, after the Northern rising. It was previous to the Pope's Bull of 1570, which threw Elizabeth into the arms of the Protestants.

² *Discorsi*, vol. i. p. 25.

ANANIAS OF SHIRAK UPON CHRISTMAS.

BY F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A., FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE, OXFORD.

From *The Expositor* (London), November, 1896.

(*In two parts.*)

PART II.

So then, if the Greeks are resolved to despise this, they have no respect either for time or for the Gospel, because of their not admitting the festival of the birth. For the one and the other show both the birth and the baptism of Christ our God to have been on one and the same day. For it is written in Luke's Gospel, in the mystery of the baptism, thus : that Jesus Himself was of about thirty years beginning. See how clearly it proves that on the same day with His birth He was baptized, and then made a beginning both of the thirtieth year of His age and of His teaching. This also do the Greeks say, that it is possible for the twelfth day to be the beginning of the year, and not its middle or end either ; if we so understand, of the seventy days also it is possible to say that it is not the middle of the year or end. But in regard to the apostolic canon, the Greeks argue thus : that the Apostles had no leisure to narrowly seek out feast days, for their occupation was in preaching, and in separating and holding (men) aloof from heathen festivals. Will any one really be content to hear such a thing said of the Apostles as that they were certainly so careless as this about the appointing of festivals ? Why, in that case, did they teach us to worship turning toward the east ? Why, also, to meet together and feast Sunday, to honour it and be idle on it ? Or to fast on the fourth day of the week and on Fridays ? For all these are lesser points than the festivals of the birth and baptism.

However, we would waive this point with them if only they would be persuaded in regard to others. For they declare in regard to the holy fathers at Nice that God concealed this from them ; for that He does

not give all graces to any one person. If the usage had not been discussed by them—yes. But they were aware of it, and condemned it, and spoke "of the Birth which in other cities they think¹ to celebrate." But I assent to those of whom the Greeks boast—I mean to the blessed Basil and Gregory Anzianz (*i.e.*, Nazianzen). Them I know to be holy, true, spiritual, and followers of the Apostles. And if they had any precept about this, I accept it, even as Paul commands, saying: "If it be revealed to a second, let the first listen."

But I perceive no precept of theirs about this festival; but St. Cyril, who appointed the lections and psalms for the two festivals, I do not understand thereby to have separated the two, but to have kept in full the rituals, and to have celebrated the feasts of both mysteries on one and the same day. But those who suppose St. Gregory to separate the feasts in his argument are not able to point to any precept of his about it, but derive some sort of evidence from his statements, and garble them to please themselves. They declare that in the discourse on the Birth he says as follows: "A little later then thou wilt see Jesus cleansed in the Jordan,"² and they declare that he pronounced this discourse on the day of the birth. And a little later on he refers to the twelve days which precede the baptism. To this we shall make this answer. I understand it thus: he simply uses his expression "a little later" in connection with the same passage, where he says, "But if thou art scandalised by His being made flesh and debasing Himself, why, then, 'a little later' thou shalt see Jesus cleansing the Jordan by His baptism, and not debasing but enriching the flesh by cleaving the heavens, and with divine grace testified unto by the Father and by the Spirit." In the second place, if you so understand the passage, then you must conceive Him as going to be baptized subsequently to His resurrection; for previously to

¹ Perhaps render "are accustomed to celebrate," as if *νομίζουσι* underlay the Armenian.

² Greg. Theol., Or. 38. In Theophania, p. 673.

this passage He has been dwelling upon His passion and resurrection, and in connection with the same He uses the same words, and says, "so then a little later." However, if you clear your mind, you will easily understand from this very discourse that He fixed both feasts on one day. For in another passage in the same discourse He speaks as follows: "But now is the feast of the Epiphany of God, for God appeared as man by birth." So, then, he combines the two. This also do the Greeks allege, that the name epiphany is used of two feasts, both of the birth and of the baptism. I reply that this is notorious to all, that the name epiphany is applied to the 6th of January, and not to the 25th of December, either by the Greeks or by other races, and that no one ever heard of two epiphanies, but only of one. If, therefore, He uses the term epiphany, and is discoursing on the birth, he clearly appoints both on one day.

Then, again, the Greeks adduce as evidence of their case the following words from the discourse on the baptism: "We have then celebrated the (things) befitting (= τὰ εἰκόντα) the birth." And pondering the same, he says: "But on this occasion the action of Christ is one thing and the secret thought another." Well, I assent. The action is one and the thought another. But not on another day. For the first words testify this to me. "We have celebrated the (things) befitting the birth," he says, and not the (fact) of the birth. For, had it been by twelve days later, he must have said the (fact) of the birth, and not the (things) of the birth.

Again, if it was not all on one day, why did he mention the day of the birth, and not simply say, "the secret thought" (or mystery), as elsewhere he does of the economy and of the passion? But you mention the depreciators while you pass over those who magnify and elevate, as the very same Gregory says. Come, then, mark me also that passage which in the discourse of baptism he utters as follows: "Three births our discourse knoweth, the one in the flesh, and the one by baptism, and the one by the resurrection." And, dwelling on the same, he adds: "All these births

my Christ manifestly honoured (the first) by the great afflatus, primal and animating; and the second by being made flesh and by the baptism, wherewith He was Himself baptized; but the third by the resurrection, which He Himself initiated. As he was the eldest among many brethren, so also He deigned to become eldest among the dead. But as touching two births—I mean the first and the last—the present is not the time to philosophise; but concerning the middle one and that which is now necessary to us; of the same name with which is the day of illumination.¹

See how he combines the two. Let them see, who have intelligence; the being made flesh and the baptism are one birth upon one day, after which, he says, is even named the day of illumination.

But let us see how the Greeks fit in with the dumbness of Zachariah the six-months-long lapse of days of the pregnancy of Elizabeth, at the end of which we must understand the day of the annunciation of Gabriel. This, however, is the arguments of the Greeks: On the same day on which Zachariah was dumbfounded, on that very day he approached his wife; and she conceived by him on the very same day. Then they count 180 days, which throws the day of the annunciation of Gabriel on to the 25th March. From that day they count 276 days of the Holy Virgin's pregnancy, to suit the ten months' gestation of the firstborn child, and that throws the birth on the 25th of December.

Now I ask you to give me your best attention while we investigate the following passage. First the text, and then the Gospel. For the text runs as follows: "My festivals consecrated shall be called holy by you. Three times in the year shall ye keep festival. Every male of you shall be before me, and ye shall offer sacrifices to the Lord."² And before that he saith: "In the seventh month, the first day thereof, let it be called holy by you. No work at all shall ye do on it." And

¹ See Gregory Naz., Discourse 39 on Holy Baptism, near the beginning.

² Deut. xvi. 16.

³ Lev. xxiii. 24, foll.

the tenth day of the same seventh month, let it be kept holy by you. Humble yourselves from the ninth day of the month for three days. And every one who shall not humble himself, he shall be destroyed out of his congregation. And let the tenth day be hallowed by you, for it is a day of expiation for you. No work shall ye do upon it. A Sabbath of Sabbaths is it (and) a rest. Ye shall offer a sacrifice to the Lord in expiation for yourselves. And the fifteenth day of the same seventh month, called the Festival of Tabernacles, shall be holy for you. No menial work shall ye do on it. In tents ye shall dwell for seven days at rest. Offer offerings to the Lord for seven days; and the seventh day shall be called holy, a Sabbath rest. No menial work shall ye do on it." So the text.

So then Zachariah's dumbness exactly fell on the tenth of Tisri; for that is the seventh month. And it was the day of expiation, on which the high priest entered the Holy of Holies, once in the year. To which also Paul bears witness. But on the same day it was not convenient that Zachariah should approach his wife; for he was the high priest of the year, and the great Feast of Tabernacles,¹ and it was impossible for the high priest to leave the congregation and go to his house; for it was far away, and he had not his dwelling in Jerusalem. And the holy Gospel is my evidence for this, for in it it is written: "And the congregation was waiting for Zachariah, and marvelled at his tarrying in the temple. And when he came out, he could not speak to them; and they understood that he had seen a vision in the temple. And he conversed with them in signs and remained dumb. And it came to pass when the days of his ministration were fulfilled, he went to his house. And after those days Elizabeth his wife conceived." See how clearly he implies that after the completion of the days of the festival it came to pass that Zachariah approached his wife. And to make the statement more sure he repeats a second time the phrase, "having completed the days of his ministry." And again, "after those days." And who can mistake

¹ Impended, and all Israel was convoked there. For seven days they were to feast the Festival of Tabernacles.

their meaning, namely, that it was so long as he was enjoining the congregation to sanctify and respect, not only the feast but also, because of the feast, the beginning of the month and the first day's evening. How then between two chief festivals could the high priest leave the congregation, and, going to his house, approach his wife? or (could he) on the very day of the feast? Be it not therefore ours to contradict and dispute, puffed up with our subtleties; but let us assent to the truth and to the Divine writings, which make it clear that it was on the tenth of the month Tisri that Zachariah approached his wife and that Elizabeth conceived. If we then count the 180 days of six months, that fixes the 16th of the month Nisan—which is the 6th April according to the Romans—and at this date was the annunciation of the Holy Virgin. Then, counting the period of ten months' gestation of the firstborn, we have a full 276 days, ending on the 21st of the month Tebeth, which is the 6th of January, according to the Romans.

Here let us take a firm stand, and one not to be overthrown. And Heaven forbid we should divide it into two. But on one day let us keep the birth and the baptism, and, maintaining intact the appointments of both, let us follow the Holy Apostles and blessed fathers of Nice and our own teachers. For it is not true that (the new Christmas) did not reach them, and that therefore they did not receive it; but a long time ago (this feast) came to our land, and was accepted as by men who were ignorant of the truth. And it lasted many, many years, until the blessed John Katholicos, who by family was a Mandakuni. And then he made search for the truth, and after inquiry and getting at the truth, he commanded it to be abandoned. And after him we too will follow and give this answer to the Greeks, that we are pupils of the holy fathers in Nice; and what we learned we keep firmly and will not twist it awry. As for you, if ye do not walk in the paths of your own fathers, it appears to me that the temper of the Jews has taken possession of you, as they taught the Samaritans. And the Samaritans kept what

they learned. But you resemble them. It does no harm to us.

But we are on surer ground than the Samaritans, and by far more sublime and divine; and for you we have no other answer. For you do not enjoin on us to do the truth but impose always on us your own tyrannical and over-subtle fancies. I know a few of the Greeks who kept this feast until the Emperor Justinian; but all were constrained by him, and received it—Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria, and every land. But be it not ours to feel any such dread of human commands as that we should override the divine. And if it please you, I will utter Job's words: If I should go wrong, make me intelligent. But if they scorn the words of truth, at least let us not turn perversely from the path of the fathers.

Let us, then, set forth clearly in what month and on what days of the month the several nations keep the holy Epiphany:

(a) The Epiphany, according to the Hebrews, falls in the month Tebeth, on the 21st day always.

(b) The Epiphany, according to the Syrians, in the month Kanoun, on the 6th day always.

(c) The Epiphany, according to the Arabs, in the month Arson (? Assam), on the 21st day always.

(d) The Epiphany, according to the Ethiopians, in the month Teras (= Tir), on the 11th day always.

(e) The Epiphany, according to the Egyptians, in the month Tubil, on the 11th day always.

(f) The Epiphany, according to the Macedonians, in the month Maimakterion,¹ on the 21st day always.

(g) The Epiphany, according to the Greeks, in the month Eudineus (*Ἐδυναιος*) on the 6th day always.

(h) The Epiphany, according to the Romans, in the month of January, on the 6th day always.

(i) The Epiphany, according to the Armenians, changes its date every four years.²

¹ Arm. has Makaterion.

² The Armenian year contained 365 days only, or one quarter of a day less than the solar year. Consequently any day of any one month in this year of the Julian era will coincide with the day pre-

And how this comes to be must be explained, and why it is not adjusted to (the dates) of other nations ; this I will explain according to the order of the calendar. But many ask why was not the day of the holy Epiphany made clear ? On what number of day of the month it falls, and we keep it, I will explain.

We have a tradition from the holy fathers. Inasmuch as it happened on the 20th day of the month, on the same day we also keep festival ; the reason of which is this : That the feast of the holy Epiphany is no Jewish feast, but a Christian one only. And since there was no need to separate it from any other (feast),¹ it was not fixed in a regular manner, nor was the day (of the week) signified ; but it was fixed by reference to the number of the day in the month on which it occurred. But some have declared about the day (of the week) of the holy Epiphany that it happened on a Friday, because on Friday was the creation of the first man ; and others assert on the Sabbath. But I am persuaded by the holy Polycarp, for he was a pupil of John the Evangelist, and heard with his own ears all the history of the Saviour. And he declares that the birth happened on the first of the week. And it was fitting that on this day on which was the beginning of creation—it was indeed portended—that on this day the Saviour of all should come into the world by being born, but keeping the virginity intact. And (he said) that the resurrection after the stay under the seal of the rock (was on the first day of the week) as also prior to that the entrance into Jerusalem on the day of the palms, and subsequently thereto the descent of the Spirit on the Apostles. But he (*i.e.*, Polycarp) declared that the day of the baptism fell, after thirty years, on the same number of day in the month, only on the fourth day of the week. And he declares that the creation of the sun

ceding it after a lapse of four years, *e.g.*, the 4th June this year will answer to the 3d June four years hence. For the Armenian calendar gains one day in four years upon the Julian.

¹ As the Christian Easter was of set purpose altered from the 14th of Nisan, the date of the Jewish Passover.

on the fourth day was for a mystery and foretype.¹ From the fourth tribe of Israel was the Saviour born, according to the Apostle (who says), that from the tribe of Judah sprang our Lord. And because we feast both events on one day of the month, it was impossible to declare the day (of the week), because they (*i.e.*, particular week days) fall, one on one day in the month, another on another.²

But we keep the number of the day of the month ;³ and for seven days we purify ourselves and fast before it, and on whatever day (*i.e.*, of the week) it falls, we feast seven days after it. For God is not limited by time or power of days, according to the Lord's utterance, that the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.

THE POPE AND THE ANGLICANS.

I.—THE SOURCES OF THE BULL. BY THE REV. T. A. LACEY.

II.—THE POLICY OF THE BULL. BY CATHOLICUS.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), December, 1896.

I.

THE SOURCES OF THE BULL.

THE Papal condemnation of the English ordinations has been received with a general murmur of complacency. Most men hastened to say that they had ex-

¹ The citation of Polycarp seems to end here.

² *I.e.*, If the 20th day of a particular month is a Friday in one year, it need not be Friday in another.

³ Ananias implies, though he does not expressly say it, that Polycarp put the Nativity on the 20th day of a month, which was a Sunday ; and exactly thirty years later, also on the 20th day of the same month, but on a Wednesday, the Baptism.

The Resurrection, the entry into Jerusalem, and the Day of Pentecost, according to the same authority, all these occurred on the first day of the week, herein agreeing with the Syriac "Teaching of the Apostles."

Ananias omits to say which of the Armenian months it was on the 20th of which the Epiphany fell.

pected nothing else ; some went further and declared, in a superior manner, that all who were looking for anything else had been living in a fool's paradise. Those who accepted the decision as final, and those who tossed it aside as of no account, vied with each other in asserting that it came as a matter of course, inevitable as the seasons ; they differed only in attributing the result severally to the infallible accuracy or to the invincible obstinacy of the Roman Church. A small minority confessed their surprise or disappointment. They had looked for something else ; not, perhaps, for a decision purely favourable, but at least for a modification of the practice hitherto prevailing, for an expression of doubt which would leave the question open for the future. Was this expectation the result merely of a sanguine temperament ? Was it begotten of an overstrung wish ?

In the early summer I was at Rome with Fr. Puller and M. Portal. As every one knows, the Pope had appointed a Commission of Inquiry to examine the question of English Orders. Two members of the Commission had expressly invited us to help them with our special knowledge of the facts. When the work of the Commission was finished we stayed in Rome for some weeks longer, in obedience to a suggestion from a very high quarter, to give further information where it was needed and desired. All this time there was undoubtedly in Rome a general expectation of something new. The Pope had himself, of his own motion, by appointing the Commission, made the question acute and practical. The reunion of the separated Churches was known to be his dearest wish, and he was understood to be specially interested in England. But Englishmen urged, with singular unanimity, that a full recognition of their Orders was a condition without which they could not even think of reunion. It was natural to suppose that in ordering an inquiry the Pope was at least hoping to remove a hindrance. Two of the Commissioners had published opinions favourable to the recognition. A third was known to have written privately on the question at the Pope's request ; his con-

clusions would probably have remained unknown had not Cardinal Vaughan, in a moment of indiscretion, revealed to a chance assembly at an English seminary the fact that he had pronounced emphatically for the validity. This was heard of at Rome, and all knew that Duchesne, Gasparri, and de Augustinis, the most distinguished historian, canonist, and theologian of the Commission, were in some sort united in defence of English Orders.

An entirely adverse decision seemed impossible. Men talked not so much about the difficulty of making a new departure, but rather about the difficulties which stood in the way of complete recognition. A very eminent ecclesiastic spoke to me of one such difficulty; it was hardly possible, he said, to recognise English Orders without defining the essentials of a valid ordination, and the Roman Church had always avoided such a definition. The practice of three hundred years, indeed, of itself cried out against a sudden reversal; yet a change of some sort seemed inevitable. "These are very extraordinary people," said a certain cardinal, after reading an account of the English Church. "Of course, we cannot acknowledge their Orders all at once, but something will have to be done." For three hundred years English clergymen submitting to the Roman Church had always been reordained. That fact alone threw a doubt upon their Orders, which would not easily be solved. But if our friends were doubtful, some of those who were at the opposite pole from friendship were equally harassed by uncertainty. One evening in May a well-known prelate of English birth was sitting in Cardinal Rampolla's ante-chamber, talking to a French Dominican lately returned from the East. "There is a big question here," he said, "about Anglican Orders. Very strange! The *High Church* claim to have valid Orders. Two French priests are supporting them—the Abbé Duchesne and the Abbé Portal. There has been a Commission of Inquiry, and the matter is now going to the Holy Office. There will not be much change—I think." A bystander, who could not help overhearing the re-

marks, noted them down, being interested in the reserve.

An Italian priest of our acquaintance who had been intimately concerned in the question, had a farewell audience of the Pope. Speaking of English affairs he said, "These Anglicans are at the door." "And I will throw it wide open," exclaimed the Pope, with enthusiasm. Our friend left Rome convinced that, whatever was the outcome of the inquiry, Leo XIII. would refuse to promulge an adverse decision. If the controversy could not be closed in a favourable sense it would at least be left open.

There were indeed other voices. A not unfriendly observer, who had the best of opportunities for knowing what would come, told us that he looked for an absolute condemnation. "It is impossible, utterly impossible," cried one of our friends impulsively. "C'est toujours l'impossible qui arrive," was the oracular reply. It was known that strenuous efforts were being made to procure such a result. During the month that followed the closing of the Commission various opinions were expressed about the next step. The Pope would send the matter to the Holy Office; he would appoint a special committee of cardinals to consider it; he would deal with it himself in person. If it went to the Holy Office, we were told, there was nothing to hope for but at best a tacit continuation of the existing practice. Most of the cardinals whom we saw professed entire ignorance of the Holy Father's intentions. A sharp struggle in the innermost councils of the Curia was anticipated. A very highly placed cardinal, in bidding us farewell, said impressively, "Remember that you have some very strong friends in Rome."

At length, we heard that all the documents and arguments were to be sent to certain cardinals on June 8, with a direction to study them carefully for a month at least. That was the very day we left Rome, and we were unable to find out whether the question was referred to the Holy Office or no. We learn from the Bull that such was the case. We do not learn, nor

could we expect to learn, anything about the discussion which ensued. The disputes of the Sacred Congregation are not made public; we are never likely to know what part was played by the strong friends of whose support we were assured. What we do know is the result. The cardinals of the Holy Office decided unanimously against the validity of English Orders.

How is the result to be accounted for? Why was the general expectation so completely falsified? It is an obvious thing to say that we see here the result of a candid and exhaustive investigation. The trend of opinion was in favour of the validity. The wishes of the Pope himself were supposed to look that way. But the truth prevailed. Careful inquiry showed the falsity of the favourable opinion; the highest wishes and the hopes that gathered round them were inevitably swept aside. It is a clear and simple argument, very comforting to those who played an active part against us in the controversy. But a slight examination of the Bull will awaken some doubts about the conclusion.

In the first place, the Bull does not bear those marks of careful and exhaustive study which might be expected. The historical argument contains extraordinary blunders, surely out of place in the finished work of experts. Some of these, which have no important bearing on my present subject, were exposed as soon as the Bull appeared. Another I shall deal with below. The theological argument is very nebulous. Its defenders are not sure of its meaning. As every one knows, the English ordinations are declared invalid on account of defective form and intention. A French writer has shown that the defect of intention is inferred from the use of a defective form.¹ But English critics of the Bull have shown that what is lacking in our form is lacking also in other forms which are recognised as valid by the Roman Church; indeed, in the ancient Roman form itself. Father Bernard Vaughan replies hotly that the fault is attributed not to the

¹ *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. Tom. iii. p. 598.

form in itself, but to the employment of the form in a new and defective sense.¹ That is to say, the defect of form results from a defective intention. The two arguments combined will make an excellent circle. Read apart, they leave us wondering what the Bull does mean. Is this the result of thorough and exhaustive study? Again, we read in the bull some old and venerable arguments which have done duty in the controversy for generations. I do not complain of that; the use of old arguments is legitimate, as long as they are thought to retain any force against old positions. But the defence of the English Ordinal has lately proceeded on new lines. Mgr. Gasparri, following the lead of his colleague, M. Boudinhon, startled us a year ago by grounding the validity of our ordinations upon the use of certain prayers, the importance of which we had overlooked. To the P. de Augustinis rumour attributed an even more startling and original defence. In the argument of the Bull we might expect to see these new defences attacked and pulverised. We find one of them barely alluded to, the other entirely ignored. Is this the outcome of a laborious investigation?

But, in the second place, the Bull itself testifies to its own origin. The decision of the cardinals is described in significant terms: "*It ad unum consensere, propositam causam iam pridem ab Apostolica sede plene fuisse et cognitam et iudicatam: eius autem denuo instituta actaque quæstione, emersisse quanto illa iustitiæ sapientiæque pondere totam rem absolvisset.*" It was not a new decision at all; the cardinals found that the Holy See had already long since decided the question; the new inquiry served only to illustrate the justice and wisdom then displayed. We learn also from the Bull what was the precedent here referred to. It was the decision of the year 1704, given by Clement XI. in the Gordon case. This, we are told, has always been regarded by the Roman Court as a final settlement; nothing but ignorance of its true nature has enabled any Catholic

¹ *Tablet*, Oct. 31, p. 706.

writer to treat the question of English Orders as an open one.¹

A natural question rises to the mind. If these circumstances were known to the authorities at Rome, why was any investigation ordered? If nothing but ignorance of these facts could render possible a free discussion of the subject, why should not that ignorance have been dispelled by simply publishing the truth? Why this apparatus of a Commission of Inquiry? Was it a farce? Respect for the personal character of Leo XIII. forbids us to attribute to him so stupid a plesantry. The appointment of the Commission must have had some serious object. What was it? It can hardly have been to inquire into the facts of the Gordon case. They were all on record. The Commissioners were assuredly not called to Rome to inform the Pope what his predecessor Clement XI. had done. Were they invited to sit in judgment on his decision? That seems an impossible subversion of parts. Why, again, was there so general an expectation of a new departure? Was this confined to those who were ignorant of the Gordon case? We found it in the minds of some who could not possibly share this ignorance. What then? Did they expect a Papal decision to be overthrown?

Here is a budget of questions. I have not a string of answers ready to hand, but I will call attention to some circumstances which may possibly throw a little light upon the difficulty. I am very imperfectly informed, and yet, at the same time, I have to be on my guard against a breach of confidence. It will easily be understood that our opportunities of acquiring knowledge at Rome were strictly limited, and at the same time some things came in our way which we are not altogether free to disclose.

Soon after the opening of the Commission we learnt

¹ Adeo ut, quoties deinceps in re simili decernendum fuit, toties idem Clementis XI. communicatum sit decretum. Quæ cum ita sint, non videt nemo controversiam temporibus nostris exsuscitam, Apostolicæ Sedis iudicio definitam multo antea fuisse: documentisque illis haud satis quam oportuerat cognitis, fortasse factum ut scriptor aliquis catholicus disputationem de ea libere habere non dubitavit.

that the chief rock ahead was the Gordon decision. We were not a little surprised. The existing practice was known to be grounded on that case, but small value was commonly attached to the precedent. What was known of it was due to Le Quien, who, in his reply to Le Courayer, published certain documents in the case obtained from the Holy Office. From these it appeared that John Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, ordained according to the English rite, who had gone into exile with James II., petitioned the Holy See to declare his Orders invalid, in order that he might be re-ordained. In his petition he set out reasons for the invalidity, including a relation of the Nag's Head fable, a preposterous account of the English Forms of Ordination, and a very inadequate complaint against the intention of the English bishops. The matter was referred to the Holy Office, and the Orders which Gordon had received were declared invalid. The decree, as given by Le Quien, was apparently based upon the statements of the petition. It was therefore supposed to be infected by the vice of its origin. It had a certain validity, as ruling the practice; but theological or argumentative value it had none. The question could be reopened, as one upon which there had been no real adjudication.

Pressing these considerations, we were told that Le Quien's account was erroneous or defective. The Holy Office did not proceed merely upon the statements of Gordon's petition. The English rites were carefully examined. A Consultor named Genetti, a man of some mark in his time, was even sent to England to pursue inquiries. As a result of these investigations, the Sacred Congregation decided that Gordon was invalidly ordained. We tried to obtain further information. We asked if we might be allowed to examine the documents in the case. We were told that the archives of the Holy Office were absolutely inaccessible. We gathered a few hints of what was going on in the Commission. It was said that Cardinal Mazzella, who presided over the sittings, forbade any attempt to go behind the Gordon decision. The Com-

mission, he said, was under the Holy Office, the commissioners were consultors of the Congregation, and could not revise the decree of their superiors. They might investigate the history of the controversy; they might analyse the constituents of the English rite; but they could not debate the validity of the form, which had already been judged invalid. This we pieced together from scattered hints. We caught a suggestion, also, that the form had been pronounced invalid because it did not consist in a prayer. This implied that in the year 1704 the Holy Office was so far penetrated by the teaching of Morinas as to rule, contrary to the then prevailing opinion of the schools, that the form of ordination must essentially be a prayer. This was hardly credible; and the less so as we know that only a month later a body of consultors of the same Congregation, in their puzzling response on Abyssinian Orders, inclined to the view that *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* was a sufficient form for priestly ordination.¹

What we heard of this matter justified the opinion freely expressed at Rome, that if our question went to the Holy Office it was useless to look for any change of the existing practice. The cardinals individually might be well disposed, but acting in the Congregation they were bound by their own precedents; they might refuse to put out any fresh condemnation, but they would not innovate. We know from the Bull that the question did go to the Holy Office, and the result more than fulfils the prediction. The Gordon decision is quoted as conclusive. Our information about the ground of that decision is also verified in part. It was based exclusively upon a defect of form and intention. But we are not told in what the defect of form consisted. Is there a definition in the documents? If so, one could wish that it had been published. We are afforded some negative information. We are told that the condemnation of Gordon's Orders did not rest upon the omission from the English rite of the *Tradition of the Instruments*. But even this is not asserted directly, as

¹ This subject is discussed in *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, App. vi.

might be expected. We are asked to infer it. If that had been the case, we are told, the Holy Office would, according to custom (*de more*), have required not an absolute but a *conditional* re-ordination. In this passage, if I am not mistaken, we have another example of extraordinary blundering in the conduct of the argument.

The classical authority for the custom referred to is a passage in that wonderful medley, the treatise "De Synodo Diœcesana" of Benedict XIV. The origin of the practice of conditional re-ordination in such a case is there referred to a certain resolution of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. The Tradition of the Instruments had been accidentally omitted in the ordination of a priest, and the Congregation was consulted as to what should be done. The prevailing opinion seems to have been that the omitted ceremony should be supplied. A decretal of Gregory IX. is quoted in support of this, and also a passage from Natalis Alexander. In deference, however, to the opinion of certain theologians who held that the Tradition of the Instruments must not be treated separately, but should cohere with other parts of the rite, the Sacred Congregation, for greater caution, ordered the whole ordination to be conditionally repeated.¹ Such is the origin of the practice. And what is the date of this resolution? It was adopted, says Benedict XIV., "*priusquam huic operi extremam manum admoveremus.*" There can be no doubt that by these words he indicates a date after his doubt was begun, and before it was finished. Now, he tells us in the Preface that he began it after his promotion to the See of Bologna and finished it after his election as Pope. He was promoted to Bologna in 1731, and was raised to the apostolic throne in 1740. Between these dates, then, falls the resolution in question. But that being so, how can it be said that in 1704 custom would have required conditional re-ordination in case the Tradition of the Instruments were omitted? The custom was not yet established.

¹ *De Synodo Diœcesana*. Lib. viii. cap. x. §§ 1, 12, and 13.

This explanation must have slipped into the Bull by an extraordinary oversight. Taken in connection with other blunders, it shows, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, how incomplete was the preparation of the materials upon which the decision was based. But to return to the point, this inference failing us, we are thrown back into entire ignorance of the specific defect alleged in the Gordon case. Cannot this ignorance be dispelled? Is it too much to hope that even yet we may have the judgment of the Holy Office published in full by authority?

How important this may be I will not try to show. Why is the Gordon precedent regarded as binding? One can easily understand that a mere Committee of Consultors was forbidden to go behind it. The Sacred Congregation itself was naturally unwilling to reverse it. But was the Roman Pontiff himself bound? All the steps that he has taken indicate a real wish to reopen the question. He cannot have appointed the Commission merely to report on a foregone conclusion. He conveyed to his intimates the idea that he was bent on a new departure. If he had followed his bent, if there had been a real investigation, the result might conceivably have been a condemnation of English orders; but the decision would have been conveyed in different terms; it would assuredly not have dealt so loosely with the terms of the problem; it would not have ignored the newer conditions of the controversy. As it is, there is no pretence of a really new decision. The old one is confirmed, and is treated as in itself conclusive. The Pope has failed to reopen the question, as he desired. What was the hindrance?

The answer is obscurely indicated in the Bull. Readers of the authorised translation were puzzled by the careful dating of the decree given in the Gordon case, *feria quinta*. The date is significant. Matters of ordinary moment are dealt with by the Holy Office in their ordinary sessions; but graver matters are reserved for an extraordinary session, presided over by the Pope in person. This extraordinary session is always held on Thursday, *feria quinta*. A decree of the Sacred Con-

gregation thus dated has therefore an additional solemnity. It is pronounced by the Pope in person, and none but the Pope can vary it. But can even the Pope vary it? A small but influential school of Roman theologians holds that he cannot. It is well known what diverse interpretations of the definition of infallibility are current in the Roman schools. There are extremists, and there are minimisers. By some of the former it is held that all decrees given by the Pope in the Holy Office, *feria quinta*, come under the definition. They are therefore, so far as they deal with faith and morals, irreformable. Not even the Pope himself may call in question the decrees of his predecessors thus pronounced. The Gordon decision would come under this rule.

Is this the way in which the Pope was bound? Is he constrained by the opinion of a small school of theologians? To the average Englishman such an idea may seem strange; he conceives the Pope as an absolute spiritual monarch, and wonders why he should not break through such trammels. But it is a fixed principle of the Roman Curia, and a principle founded in grave reasons, never to act in a manner that would directly contravene any theological opinion seriously maintained in the schools and tolerated by the Church. This *tutiorism*, as it is called—this principle of always following the safer course—finds its chief scope in regulating the practice of the Church with regard to the sacraments; but it is obviously applicable also to such delicate questions as those which turn upon the definition of infallibility. No decision of the Holy See can safely be impugned which, in the opinion of any serious theologians, is infallible and irreformable. The Pope himself could not revise it, unless he should first formally reprobate and extinguish the opinion which bars his way. But the formal reprobation of an opinion maintained by grave theologians is the most extreme exercise of the Papal authority; it is a thing to be done only under pressure of urgent necessity.

If, then, I am not misinformed, the Pope found himself practically debarred from reopening any question

touching faith and morals decided in the Gordon case. There may have been a debate, a struggle, over the value to be assigned to the opinion which stood in the way. There may have been an argument about the scope of the Gordon decision itself, and its relation to faith or morals. It must have had some relation to facts as well. The question of what constitutes the essential form in the English rite is a question of fact. And hence arises the importance of knowing accurately the terms of the decision. It pronounced the form of the English rite invalid. But what was regarded as the form? The majority of theologians would say that some one prayer or other formula must constitute the essential form. Others would find it in a combination of the various elements which the rite contains. Taking the former view, theologians of acknowledged eminence have pointed out several prayers in the Ordinal which, in their judgment, are sufficient. But others, again, have fastened upon some element of the rite as the essential form, which no one could defend as adequate. There is, for example, a sort of blessing, which follows the examination of the candidates. This was regarded by Billuart as the form, and he pronounced it insufficient; a judgment in which every theologian would probably concur. Whence did he derive his idea? Is it possible that this was the form which the Holy Office declared defective? If so, the decision, so far as it concerns the faith, was one with which no English theologian will quarrel. We should reply that there was an error with regard to the facts. But in that case the decision is not, in the view of any theologian, irreformable. The most extreme interpretation of the Vatican definition will not make the Pope infallible in matters of fact. In the recent Bull we find a similar inaccuracy. Here, again, the Pope has taken as the essential form of the English rite a phrase which, at all events apart from its context, no English divine acknowledges to be such. This he declares insufficient. We have no quarrel with him on that account. Some of us may contend that the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," taken by themselves, would be a suffi-

cient form ; but the contention is purely academic, and has no bearing on the validity of English Orders. We have other objections, and graver ones, to the reasons on which the declaration is grounded ; but whether they be good or bad, their application to the question at issue is vitiated by the error in matter of fact. It is not impossible that in the Gordon case, if all the documents were published, a like state of things would be disclosed. A theological proposition, which we should not be able or should not care to dispute, may have been erroneously applied to the facts of the English ordinations.

On these grounds I urge the importance of a disclosure of all that can be known about the Gordon case. I hope that my motives in pressing this will not be misconstrued. They are the same as those which stirred all with whom I was acting in our visit to Rome, and in the movement which led to that visit. With a single eye to a future, and perhaps far distant, reunion of Christendom, we laboured to find a course by which the Church of Rome might retreat from a false position with the least possible loss of dignity, with the least possible dislocation of traditional policy. We have reason to believe that our labours were looked upon with no disfavour by the highest authorities. In spite of that, we have met with a grievous disappointment. "I do not know that I shall ever recover from this blow," writes one of our friends over sea. But, in recovering from the first sense of defeat, our plain duty is thoroughly to search out the causes of the disappointment. I make this essay in that direction. If it be true that we stumbled upon a decision of the Holy See which, on the tutorist principle, is covered by the definition of infallibility, our difficulty is narrowed down to a clear issue. If the Gordon decision stands in the way because of a theological opinion regarding it as irreformable, then the question of English Orders can be effectively reopened only on one of three conditions : Either the definition of infallibility must be abandoned, or the restraining opinion must be reprobated, or the decision itself must be shown faulty in matter of

fact. The first alternative would, no doubt, commend itself to most Englishmen, but it is not matter of present discussion ; the second raises difficulties which we are not yet called upon to face ; the third is dependent upon evidence that may possibly be forthcoming.

The recent Bull itself adds little or nothing, I believe, to the difficulty. It stands or falls with the Gordon decision. The reasoned arguments which it contains can easily be set aside. I note one point, the importance of which I am unable to gauge. The Pope tells us that he summoned the cardinals of the Holy Office before him, *feria quinta*, and they gave their judgment. But he did not there and then confirm it.¹ He took time to consider, and eventually gave his decision in the form of a Bull. Has he thus avoided a pronouncement, which, in the opinion of some theologians, would be irreformable? Those who would fain share the hopes which some of us entertain, need not be discouraged by the air of finality, the atmosphere as of the Medes and Persians, which is cast about the decision by the use of the curial language. Minds that are unfamiliar with that remarkable dialect may be awestruck by the solemn condemnation of all who shall challenge the Bull as obreptitious or subreptitious. But these are of course only the common forms of the Chancery. It is pretty safe to assume that in the Bull itself there is nothing to prevent a reopening of the question.

It is manifest that without such reopening, the reunion of Christendom remains impossible. The Church of England has not a shadow of doubt concerning her own Orders, and cannot tolerate the expression of doubt by others. Until they are fully acknowledged there can be no union. But the Church of England is not a neglicable quantity in Christendom. She is not like the separate Churches of the East, venerable for their antiquity, more venerable for their steadfastness through centuries of repression and persecution, but

¹ Verumtamen optimum factu duximus supersedere sententiæ, quo et melius perpenderemus conveniretne expediretque eandem rem auctoritate nostra rursus declarari, et uberiorem divini luminis copiam supplices imploraremus.

insignificant in numbers, stationary or retrograde in point of influence. It was said to me by a Roman friend who is deeply versed in the problem, that Rome, England and Russia are the three great factors in the reunion of Christendom, and that a union of any two of these, excluding the third, would only aggravate the evil of disunion. Therefore, every one who would labour for union must labour also for the favourable solution of the question of the ordinations.

I do not pretend that this is the only or the greatest difficulty. There remain great questions, going down to the roots of Christian practice, if not of Christian belief, the solution of which would overturn any mere human wisdom. No one can hope for reunion who does not believe in the divine origin and the divine ordering of the Church. But to them who believe in this there is no word impossible. They watch for opportunities. They welcome every expression of hope, coming from whatever side. On the morning of the day we left Rome we were waiting in Cardinal Rampolla's antechamber, when there came out from the inner room a number of cardinals, who had been attending a congregation. One of them spied us, came up, and seizing a hand of each cried aloud : " Vous partec donc aujourd'hui ; trop tôt, trop tôt ! Mais nous nous reverrons ; nous arrangerons nos différends ; nous nous reverrons." It was done so publicly that I need not reserve his name. I do not expect to see Cardinal Segna again ; but as long as I live I shall remember his kindness, and I have an unshaken faith in the fulfilment of the rest of his prophecy.

II.

THE POLICY OF THE BULL.

The question of Anglican Orders was taken up in connection with the appeal for union made by Leo XIII. in the Encyclical "*Præclara*" of 1894, and more particularly in his letter to the English people. The group of Anglicans of whom Lord Halifax is the spokesman took this appeal seriously, and ever since that time

negotiations have been going on more or less continuously between them and the Vatican. It is not easy to say exactly what the negotiations were. There were intermediaries. Leo himself was very reserved with Lord Halifax; but others took upon them to foster hopes. No doubt it was the Anglican party who put forward the question of Orders, as a starting-point for further action. The Pope acceded to an examination of the question. The idea of an incorporate union, so dear to Lord Halifax, and so much favoured in the first instance by the Pope, could only be carried out on the basis of a prior admission that the Anglican Church had an existence as a Church, and was therefore in a position to discuss a union with the Roman Church. Once recognise the validity of her Orders, and it would be possible to go into conference as to the points of difference between the two Churches, and the means of coming to an agreement. It is quite certain that the Pope entered heartily into these views. The Abbé Duchesne was accordingly deputed to inquire into the validity of the Anglican Orders, and was well aware that a favourable conclusion would be very well received. This was before the Abbé was put at the head of the French College at Rome. He made his investigation, arrived at the conclusion that the Orders were valid, sent his report to the Vatican, and received from Cardinal Rampolla a letter of thanks and congratulations, together with a grand silver medal, which the Holy Father sent him as a sign of his satisfaction and particular goodwill. All this happened in the winter of 1894-95.

In the autumn of 1895 the idea of union was in higher favour at the Vatican than ever. Cardinal Rampolla encouraged the foundation of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, a journal devoted to the treatment of problems concerning the union of Churches, and particularly the reunion of the Anglican Church, and edited by the Abbé Portal, a French priest, and a personal friend of Lord Halifax.

This movement in favor of union was, however, regarded by the Catholics in England with no little ap-

prehension and mistrust, and their opposition alone would have been sufficient to wreck it for the time being. Cardinal Vaughan viewed the idea of incorporate union as a chimera, but treated the efforts to realise it as a real danger. He got articles written against the validity of Anglican Orders; and on this side the controversy was conducted with no little heat. Leo, who would fain have maintained an attitude of judicial impartiality, soon found out that he must take a side: he must either definitely encourage the hopes of the Anglicans, or he must do something to calm the excited fears of the Catholics. Even at Rome, if we except the Pope and Cardinal Rampolla, who for a long time fondly hoped that they could make this policy of union a means of accomplishing very large results, theological opinion was adverse to the validity. Were there not, indeed, decisions of the Sacred Congregations which settled the dispute? There were, but in spite of them all the Pope was not disabused of his fancy. Compelled at last to take some action, he named a Commission of theologians, which sat at Rome in the spring of the present year, under the presidency of Cardinal Mazzella. The Pope wished to put the Abbé Duchesne on the Commission, as well as two or three others who had pronounced in favour of validity, or, at all events, thought the matter still open to discussion. Cardinal Vaughan, on the other hand, had sent three theologians from England to argue for the nullity of the Orders and to oppose any idea of compromise, for this was the light in which the recognition of a doubt in the matter would have been considered. All the members of the Commission were bound to the strictest secrecy, so that it is impossible to find out exactly what happened; which is the less to be regretted because it is quite certain that nothing happened of the least importance. The theologians set forth the arguments which favoured their respective views; papers were written, and, after a series of deliberations, a report was placed in the hands of the Pope. No conclusion was arrived at; none could be come to in this preliminary assembly. Only the mate-

rials for a judgment were worked out, in case his Holiness should think fit to pronounce a decision. It is, perhaps, worth while to mention that two English clergymen, the Rev. Messrs. Lacey and Puller, were in Rome during this discussion. Of course, they were not admitted to the secrets of the Commission, but their presence bore witness to the great interest their party took in the matter, the hopes which the Court of Rome had semi-officially encouraged, and the prospect that was still left to the partisans of validity.

Before quitting Rome, when the labours of the Commission were at an end, the learned Anglicans had no longer to second the efforts of the friends of validity, they attended a Mass celebrated by the Pope along with the Abbé Portal, and then went home, without being told what judgment his Holiness was to give. By this time, toward the end of June, there was no expectation of a decision favourable to validity, but it was still hoped that the Pope might discreetly maintain silence, and leave the question open as a moot point for theologians. Mr. Gladstone's intervention, which was brought to bear toward the end of May, would seem to have been designed to lead to this result; not that he himself would have moved for so slight an end, but that the Anglican friends of union, finding the English Catholics press so hard for a positive condemnation of their Orders, thought that the intervention of the Grand Old Man would influence the mind of the Pope. A minor demonstration, the speech of the Abbé Portal at an Anglican meeting in London, on July 16, had, no doubt, the same object. But by this time the question was already settled in the Pope's mind, and he actually was on the point of signing the decision against Anglican Orders.

There is not the smallest doubt that the Pope gave way before the violent pressure of the English Catholic bishops and the Roman congregations. After the advances which he had himself made to the Anglicans, his best course, if he could neither pronounce formally for the Orders nor recognise them as doubtful, would have been to say nothing. He assuredly was not in

want of precedents. But the party of tradition carried him away. Cardinal Vaughan did everything in his power to obtain the decision he wanted. His last and perhaps most telling stroke was a collective letter from the whole of the Catholic Episcopate of the United Kingdom. This letter has not been published, so that its date and exact contents cannot yet be given ; but its existence is absolutely certain. It must have been sent to Rome before the appearance of Mr. Gladstone's letter. Doubtless what the bishops pointed out to the Pope in this document was exactly what Cardinal Vaughan had been saying ever since the question of union was first raised—namely, that an incorporate union was a chimera ; that to recognise Anglican Orders would be subversive of Catholicism in England ; that the doubt that prevailed as to the sacraments of the Established Church was precisely a cause of individual conversions, which would diminish in number if it were recognised that there was any chance of English Orders proving valid ; that English Catholicism, in a way, lived by the belief that they were null and void, and would be wounded to the quick if the decision were suspended, or even if condemnation were postponed. The Pope himself tells us, in the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, that he left the final examination of the question to the congregation of cardinals called "Suprema." In this way he covered his retreat, by enlightening his judgment. The Encyclical, *Satis Cognitum*, on the unity of the Church, had already been published, on June 29, with a view to show the Anglicans that there was no desire for union in the proper sense of the word, but only for their submission to the Roman authority. Leo XIII., perhaps, would have liked to stop at that point ; but that Encyclical had satisfied nobody, neither the English Catholics nor the Anglicans. It was necessary therefore to take some further step.

The "Suprema" met on July 16, under the presidency of the Pope. All the cardinals were of opinion that the matter had been long since decided, and that the debates in the preliminary commission had served

to show how wise the decision had been. Leo XIII. added that he had not therefore come to the resolution to renew the condemnation pronounced by his predecessor, but that he had now finally made up his mind to take this step, in order to prevent the pernicious error into which many persons might fall, of thinking that they found "the sacrament and the fruits of order" where they did not really exist. That is always the staple argument of the English Catholics. To allow it to be believed that Anglican Orders are valid, would be to dry up the source of individual conversions. We may well believe that this argument was again pressed upon the Pope during the month of August. At all events, the Bull declaring Anglican Orders null and void was published about the middle of September.

Considered simply as a theological document, and from the point of view of its authority in Catholic eyes, the decision is certainly final. It carries with it the whole of the authority of the Pope; it can never be reviewed. The arguments on which it rests are by no means without weight. Leo XIII. says that Anglican ordinations are void for want of form and for want of intention, the framers of the Anglican ritual having, of their own accord, struck out of the liturgical formula every word which expressed the nature and object of the Christian priesthood, and especially in what concerned the matter of the Eucharist. Their forms, taken in their natural sense, do not imply the conferring of the real priesthood, and their editors had no intention of bestowing any supernatural power. There is, therefore, no sacrament. That which there is no will to do is not done; no power is given where none is intended.

These arguments are by no means contemptible, and it would be easy for Catholic theologians to defend on this issue the pontifical decision. But I prefer here to indicate two consequences which flow from it, rather than to expatiate on its legitimacy. In order to condemn Anglican Orders the Pope has had to lay down the principle that a form of consecration which would be sufficient in the case of an orthodox rite is insuffi-

cient in the Anglican Church, because in the orthodox rite the formula is understood with an implicit meaning which the Anglicans chose to exclude. The sacrament can therefore no longer be regarded as a sort of magic formula working in virtue of its own force independently of the sense attached to it by those who use it. The administration of a sacrament must consequently be an intelligent act, a human act. The popular theology does not give prominence to this idea; it will henceforth be necessary to bring it up to that point.

Further, the preliminary Commission brought before the Cardinals and the Pope the history of the sacrament of Holy Orders. But they did not express all that they thought about it. Leo XIII., who knew well that in ancient times ordination was conferred simply by laying on of hands, with prayer, has said that the laying on of hands was the substance of the sacrament; but he said it in passing, and with some verbal and mental reservation; for his predecessor Eugenius IV., when presiding at the Council of Florence, defined the substance of ordination to be the presentation of the cup, etc. Theologians have sometimes endeavoured to pare down the meaning of this conciliar declaration, but it can only be done by subterfuge. In order to reconcile Eugenius IV. with Leo XIII., and harmonise theology with history, it will be necessary more and more to give up the mechanical notion of the sacrament, to find room for the idea of development, to accord to the Church the power of determining both the substance and the form of the sacrament of ordination. This decision of Leo XIII. may therefore prove to be a new point of departure in sacramental theology. But I must add that, in all probability, this result was neither perceived nor intended by any of those who took part in the publication of the decree.

There is another consequence which was even less foreseen or desired by the Pope and the Cardinals, or by those who pressed for the nullity of the Orders. The negotiations for the reunion of the Anglican Church, if undertaken at all seriously, could have had no other object than the promotion of a united Angli-

can Church, having its own discipline and some kind of administrative autonomy, and being, to some extent, withdrawn from the domination which the Papacy—as conceived by the Jesuits, the Roman Cardinals, and the Pope himself—claims and exercises over every province of life, intellectual, social, and political. Such a united Church could only have been Roman in the sense of having the tie of communion, and of a subordination little more than theoretical. This has not been considered a gain; it has rather been dreaded as involving a real peril. The presence of a group of Catholics cultivating the domain of religious knowledge with a certain freedom, not running everlastingly to Rome to find out what they were to think in matters belonging to the purely human order of things, civil and national, enjoying their own self-government, and disposed rather to give advice to Rome than to take instructions from her—might not this have proved a dangerous example for the Catholicism of the rank and file who are thoroughly broken in and accustomed to blissful and absolute submission? The more the infusion of a new element into Roman Catholicism is really to be wished for, the more it has been dreaded by those who find in immobility the security of religion. Whatever one may think of its grounds, the condemnation of Anglican Orders, in existing circumstances and notwithstanding the personal tendencies of any who have worked for it, is none the less a victory for that party which would make of Catholicism a fixed religion without movement, disciplined like a regiment, inert in thought, devoted absolutely to the glorification of its chief and existing only for him. It is lawful to hope that this ideal, which is not precisely that of the Gospel, will never be realised. But that hope derives no support from present appearances.

THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK IN ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., PRINCIPAL MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD, ENGLAND.

From *The Outlook* (New York), December 19, 1896.

THE man who is in the thick of the *mêlée* sees least of the fight; the onlooker who has the double advantage of a keen eye and a high position sees most of the game. In other words, the man who lives in the midst of the religious thought and life of England is least able, from the very intensity of his interests and the extent of his concern, to see things in their proper perspective, or judge them in their true proportions. But so far as I am able to detach myself from the field of action, and transport myself to a position where it becomes the field of vision, I would say that the outlook is, on the whole, full of promise, though also crowded with forces whose action and issue no man can watch without an anxiety strangely blended of confidence and fear.

I may begin by noting the remarkable change in the attitude of the working classes.

In the two previous generations secularism was very largely their common creed. They spoke the language of Tom Paine; they attacked sacred history and literature with a fierce and crude naturalism which despised the historical sense, knew no reverence for the religious emotions, and followed a logic whose premises were as narrow as its conclusions were broadly bald and negative. Now the social idea is stronger than the secular. We have the claims of labor rather than the rights of man, and positive theories as to the relation of classes to the distribution of wealth, the limits and the laws of property. This is in its attitude toward religion a more hopeful spirit than the secular. The workingmen of to-day may be no more reconciled to the churches than those of yesterday, they may be even more distinctively alienated in feeling and hostile in speech, but their new notion of society and labor

makes direct appeal to ethical principles, and invokes teachings and sanctions which can be described only as religious. They do not assail religion in the narrow way of the old prosaic secularism, but they speak more fiercely concerning the churches as the support of capital, the sanctuary of class distinctions, and the sanction of the order that seems to bar the coming of the millennium. But this attitude to the churches expresses now and then a passion for religious ideals, or what may be so conceived. Then on the side of the churches there has been a corresponding movement. With a perfectly new zeal they have been seeking to serve the cause of social amelioration and to understand the claims of the workers. Christian Socialism is in the air. It has its home alike in the Anglican and the Free Churches. Those University Settlements which have a distinctly religious basis and function are serving it. The men who went to convert the East End of London have been in a great measure converted by it; and, alike by tongue and pen and service, the churches are laboring to make the cause of our helpless classes their own. This is the really hopeful phase of the matter. The desire of the churches to love mercy, to do justly, to walk humbly before God, has never been more manifest, and it is possible that in the lapse of a generation or two they may have achieved something in the way of reclaiming those millions that have, by the sheer stress of the struggle for life, been forced out of those communities that have, while teaching men to do well, lived too much for the well-to-do.

In another class, between the workmen and the middle class proper, the outlook is perhaps more troubled. I mean the large class of small traders. Life is pressing very hard upon them; the difficulty of making both ends meet is greater with them than with the artisans. Income is less assured and too precarious to relieve from grinding daily care, profits are reduced to the narrowest margin, the time demanded by business leaves no space for the cultivation either of the minds or of the conscience. This class has hitherto been, on the whole, religious, but it seems to me as if the pres-

sure that had alienated so many of our workmen was beginning to sour the spirit of the tradesman. He is the man who is hit most heavily by the financial needs of modern legislation, who suffers most from the growth of great distributing businesses, who is forced to feel in the most acute form the uncertainty and the drudgeries that belong to living from hand to mouth. And the churches or chapels the tradesmen frequent are often those placed in districts forsaken of the rich, and they sit amid their all too squalid neighborhoods like forlorn monuments of a lost prosperity. There is indeed nothing in the religious outlook that I like so little as the isolation of classes, for it is so provocative of the social suspicion and mutual distrust which act like the very breath of winter on the fair flowers of faith. It is so promoted by the new geographical conditions of our great cities, the flight of business men from the place where they transact their business, the abandonment of the multitudes that live either by daily labor or by supplying the laborer with daily bread, by those who employ or who find the capital to pay the employed. This, indeed, is one of the forces generated by the industrial revolution against which the churches have need to contend most strenuously, and yet against which the most strenuous contention seems to avail the least. Among the middle classes the power of religious convention and custom seems to be on the increase, while as much cannot be said of the potency of ideals and ideas. The middle-class counterpart of the workman's socialism is class distinction, sectionalism, the apotheosis of the conventions which divide.

The older middle classes were very open to ideas and very sensitive to ideals. They believed intensely in freedom; in the emancipation of the slave; in the excellence of free institutions; in government of the people by the people.

The great leaders of the middle classes were more distinguished by a lofty idealism than were the spokesmen of the lords and gentry. If we compare the generous and ideal humanity of Richard Cobden with the hard and sordid selfishness of the Tory squires who be-

lieved in protecting the land at the expense of the people's food, or the broad and ethical philanthropy of John Bright with the exclusive and rigorous Chauvinism of the men who so fiercely opposed him, we may see how the very industrial and economic changes that were pleaded for were advocated on grounds that were moral rather than material.

But to-day the middle classes have waxed fat and grown contented. Ideals move them less; the institutions and conventions which have been so kind to them they prize more and more. They have become too comfortable, and they dearly like the comfort into which they have come. Small blame to them in one sense, for it makes life a pleasant thing to wander through; but for progress there is nothing so fatal as to have attained.

A feature in the religious situation which specially affects our middle classes is the growth of æstheticism in worship. It is part of the general movement in matters of taste that marks the time—a taste too self-conscious to be delicate, too fastidious to be fine, too much a distinction of class to be inbred, or, indeed, more than underbred; but it has had and is having a most unwholesome influence on congregational worship. Men think so much of modes, love so much sensuous elegance, richness of detail, and harmony of effect, that the conduct of worship is becoming a sort of depraved fine art. The attitude to God tends to fall out of consideration, through the emphasis which is laid upon the agreeableness to man. To say this is not to advocate a squalid worship, heartless, mean, vulgar; but rather to say that what we need is an awed worship in which the feeling of what satisfies God is all in all and what is pleasant to man does not in any degree come into consideration. We hear too much of short services and bright services, Pleasant Sunday Afternoons, warm and cheerful gatherings; what we need is a keener sense of what God is in worship, and what man ought to be before Him.

So far as concerns thought and criticism, the outlook has never in my experience been so bright. The heart

of man is more reconciled to theology, simply because in theology there is more of the heart of God. Criticism is coming to be the exercise of religious minds rather than the hostility of an irreligious rationalism. There could happen no greater calamity to religious thought than that religious scholarship, research, and criticism should be in the hands of men whose aims are simply negative. It is hardly possible to overestimate the gain which religion has made by, as it were, capturing the critics. They are not less thorough, not less distinguished by love of truth, not less learned than the men who went before them, so many of whom used the higher criticism as a weapon of offense against faith. Nay, in all these things we may say that, on the whole, the new men are superior to the old, but their pre-eminence lies partly in deeper reverence and in keener sympathy with the thought they deal with in the past and the spirits they speak to in the present, but especially in the marvellous reconciliation they have accomplished between critical freedom and spiritual truth. The Church of Christ has, therefore, it seems to me, problems enough to tax her strength, hopes enough to inspire her with courage, and reason enough to use her splendid opportunities, which were never greater than they are to-day, for the reconciliation of man with man, and of men with God.

This paper ought not to conclude without a reference to the desire for unity, which may be said to be common to all the churches. Rome seeks to effect on her own terms—those of absorption—union with the Anglicans; many Anglicans have craved such unity with Rome as would be involved in the recognition of their orders. The Evangelical Free Churches are drawing together in various forms of co-operation and confederation, the most notable form being a system of councils, local and general. All this speaks hopefully to those who feel the evil and wastefulness of division. But I confess to having only a qualified appreciation of this desire for unity. Variety is a more divine thing than uniformity; difference, though not division, belongs to the realms both of nature and grace; and it is

as easy to make too much of unity as to make too light of difference. The passion for agreement may mean only indifference to the more serious convictions which divide and ought to be allowed to distinguish men and societies. We suffer at this moment with a tendency to deal insincerely with beliefs in order that we may deal kindly with cognate communities, and I am not clear that a kindly unity gained by good-natured obliviousness in points of difference is worth the price paid for it. But what is pure gain is the growth of interdenominational courtesy, and the feeling that the brother from whom we differ is as much a son of God as those of our own immediate fellowship. The Church that feels too ashamed of the Athanasian anathema to use it is not far from the kingdom of heaven. And the only unity compatible with life and truth will have been reached when each Church can say to all the rest, "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM IN PURITAN CHURCHES.

BY REV. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D.

From *The Congregationalist* (Boston), December 17, 1896.

WHAT concord between Puritanism and symbolism? In first view there seems none, either in worship or church architecture. Above all, the Puritan sought for :

The *Veritas* that lurks beneath
The letter's unprolific sheath.

Penetrating to the core and fountain of truth, he cast away type and shadow. Men had too long used the likeness to hide the reality. Nevertheless, there is no divorce between Calvinism and art. The iconoclasts were Anabaptists if anything. Calvinism liberated the state and society from a corrupt church or, rather, corporation. It did not neglect the body while feeding the soul, but demanded a free and honorable citizen life

addressed to human nature. It made no war against beauty, but it changed the standards of worth. Thoroughly democratic, it brought art to the common people and into the home which it glorified. It had little sympathy with nude art, because in the creation of that woman is first forced to conquer her shame. It taught an unbounded love of safeguarded liberty. It emancipated art from the monopoly of the noble and the priest, the rich and the powerful, and gave it to the common man. Giving art back again unto itself, it disclosed a field hitherto unknown in that every-day human life which Jesus himself glorified. It was in a Protestant republic that art found its richest bloom. Calvinism is not vandalism.

The Puritan is not a hater, but a lover, of beauty. Give him but one mediator between God and man, brush away the monopolies, the scaffolding and the symbols ordained by selfish human corporations, and his desire for what God makes and loves is found to be deep and abiding. The Dutch Puritan not only kept his palette and chisel, his organ and his music, but he turned his country, a morass by nature, into a lovely picture of art. He made the home a model, and clothed the citizen, burgher and boer alike, in costumes clean and bright. The French Puritan was an insatiable lover of curtesy, fine manners, home comforts and adornments. The German Puritan held to the richness of his inheritance from his forest forefathers, while sloughing off the corrupting foreignism of Rome. The English Puritan's dress, wool and white linen, in its simple dignity, with clean body and nothing false on face and hair, is even to-day the delight of the artist. It was the Puritan Milton who sang of

The high embow'd roof
With antic pillars massy proof,
And storied windows, richly dight,

as well as of "full voiced quires" and "pealing organs."

Furthermore, if the descendants of Pilgrims and Puritans who (mistakenly) deem their fathers to have

buried beauty in the "image-storm" do count it duty to follow in ancestral footsteps, then we can understand why Congregationalists, British and American, lose so many of their children. A steady stream of carriages before the doors of "the Establishment" beyond sea, and many of the Puritans' descendants in the American Episcopal churches, do but show that human nature craves the symbol when robed in beauty.

As matter of fact, unshackled from the compulsion of a state church and in free America at liberty to choose, lovers of beauty have come to a new mind. Increasingly they follow the Scriptures which they so love in wisely making use of the symbol in letter, color and form. Behold their "platforms," "declarations," creeds and confessions—structures built of the "letter that killeth," especially when too much abounding. They are recovering also, "for glory and for beauty," whatever is an aid to worship. Even the Congregationalists have their saints and holy places, after whom, after which they name their churches and think it no sin—Robinson, Eliot, Winthrop, Harvard, Maverick, Pilgrim, Plymouth, Mayflower, Leyden. They, too, love beauty in pictures. Witness the tasteful publications, with generous use of Christian symbolism, of the C. S. S. and P. S., and their homes and church parlors. Behold the tremendous revolution wrought in meeting house architecture. So, also, the historic spirit waxing nobly strong, they honor and reverence, but without idolatry venerate, precious relics from home lands beyond sea, even building them into their church walls. Already they have in their calendar of days, Week of Prayer, one Sunday for prison reform, another for missions or local charities, this festal day or that, enough to make a new Christian year. Behold also their enrichment of worship, prayer, praise and song, with responses, the people taking part instead of the parson monopolizing all.

In a word, the children of the Puritans are less Protestant and more Christian. They are no longer afraid of Rome. Giant Grim has become a quiet prisoner. They do not protest against the pope and his corpora-

tion. They watch them. Readiness is shown even to receive the Romanist, when purged, into the true, that is the Congregational, fold. The Puritan descendants honor, according to the eternal fitness of things, what is local, historic, providential. They see God in history. Reasonable play is allowed the affections of life and proprieties of feeling in memorials and gifts which take artistic form. They would be clean every whit. Their prayer is, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." Nor, wiser than what is written, would they reform beyond Scripture limits. What "for glory and for beauty" Jesus and the apostles have suggested and what within the realm of symbolism is shadowed forth in Biblical parable, metaphor, allegory, trope and proverb, they believe may be used for edification. Hence, their readiness to embody in art, for holy use on font, table, book, tablet, program, church wall, front or roof, for temporary decoration or for permanent memorial, what will teach not legendary, but Biblical truth. Are not these the facts?

Believing that we state no more than truth, may we not here, with practical intent to aid building committees, architects of Congregational church edifices and all those who would beautify God's sanctuary and make the place of his feet glorious, suggest the riches and the limitations of church ornamentation?

Avoiding what is purely sectarian and all that suggests the church legend of Christ and his associates rather than the reality of gospel record unstained by factitious or belated tradition, we suggest the following as legitimate and appropriate within the Congregational meeting house:

1. Symbols taken wholly from Scripture.
2. The use of what will ascribe and manifest in beautiful forms glory and thanksgiving to God because of his signal providences in the history of our fathers and of their children.
3. Grateful acknowledgments of local blessings, advantages or talents.
4. The expression within carefully marked limits of those human affections, implanted in us of God, and

out of which duties spring, such as the filial, paternal, fraternal and patriotic.

Puritanism rightly interpreted believes not only that God was but that he is. It does not, as in Roman Catholicism, lay stress upon the physical sufferings of Christ but upon his whole life (as well as upon his last agony), and his life in us as the hope of glory. Hence while we may, rightly I think, make visible expression of the cross, the nails, the hammer, the crown of thorns, the scourge, the reed, sponge and spear, these will be in subordination to the more joyous symbolism so richly set forth in his own parables. The coin, the lamp, the sower, the woman with leaven, the hid treasure, the pearl of great price, the ten virgins, the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, the publican and the Pharisee have all not only a permissible but an honored place in that Christian symbolism that knows no sect. Surely it is as right, as it is much more beneficial, to teach these ever fresh truths in the guise of plastic and manual as well as literary art, and by the permanent stone of the wall or glass of the church windows as by the types, lithograph or chromo.

First of all, near the pulpit should be the necessary articles of furniture significant of the two sacraments, the eucharist and baptism, which Christ ordained—the communion table and the baptismal font. On these three features, or elsewhere in the edifice, may be represented the appropriate Scripture emblems of the corn and wine, or wheat and grapes. The lily, the lamb, the lion, the dove, the olive branch, the palm, the burning bush, the tongues of fire, the Alpha and the Omega in Greek letters, or the four Hebrew consonants of the name Jehovah, the burning candle, the Bible and the communion chalice, or bread trencher, the seven-branched golden candlestick, the four faces of the living creature in Revelation, the ox, the lion, the eagle and the man, are all Scriptural emblems, and there are many more that could be used with edifying effect. In America the trailing arbutus flowers may surely have a place in our symbolism, as a token of God's kindly providence and loving message to the Pil-

grims. The "lily among thorns" is a symbol of a holy life amid worldly temptations, and of a church pure amid errors lifting itself up to the light of God. No age can wither, nor custom stale, the appropriateness of this symbol in churches allied with that of Scrooby, Leyden and Plymouth.

In God's care for the sparrow and the raven, his clothing of the lily, in the migration of birds, in the sweet alternation of the seasons, in the deep instinct of the furred, the feathered or the finned tribes we have symbols manifold and touching. Surely we have Christ's implied authority for the use of these whereby we may glorify God, even as we are exhorted so to do in the Bible.

Reserving for a future article treatment of temporary decoration and the outside of the meeting house, may we all ever pray, "Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish thou the work of our hands upon us, yea the work of our hands establish thou it."

PROFESSOR HARNACK ON MODERN PROTESTANTISM.

BY A CORRESPONDENT.

From *The Independent* (New York), December 24, 1896.

THE sensation of the hour in the religious world of Germany is the address delivered at the Convention of Liberal Theologians, held in October in Eisenach, by the brilliant Church historian of the Berlin University, the successor of Neander, Professor Harnack, probably the most influential theological professor in the Fatherland. The address discusses principles and facts that have an international interest, and the discussion it has elicited is only second to that which followed, several years ago, on Harnack's attack on the biblical character of portions of the Apostles' Creed. As the author claims that the most bitter attacks were caused by unsatisfactory digests of his address, he has

published the whole in the *Christliche Welt*, of Leipzig, No. 44 *h. a.*, and we here reproduce the chief contents.

1. The author begins by stating that it is not his purpose to speak of the present condition and future prospects of the Protestant State Churches, but of the status and future of Protestantism. The Protestant Churches are not in a process of decay or retrogression, but of consolidation and renewal of strength. The State Churches occupy the position that Christianity did in the Roman Empire, and their power now is really greater than ever. There are no indications of an approaching separation of State and Church in Germany.

But matters look differently when we take a glance at Protestantism itself. It is true that the old firm name Protestant still exists; but like many firm names it does not indicate the actual state of affairs. The character of Apostolic claimed by the Church of the Middle Ages was shown by the Reformation to have been a misnomer. And the question is really whether modern Protestantism is still to that degree Protestant in which the Church of Rome is Apostolic. At any rate the mere name does not decide the matter.

2. What was original Protestantism and what were its characteristics? The Protestant was a Church which was based *exclusively* on the *articula fidei* drawn from the Sacred Scriptures, and recognized it as its sole mission to secure the adherence of its members to these teachings. In Protestantism, accordingly, there exists a fixed and *exclusive* relation between theology and the Church. The doctrines of faith, which at bottom are the same as the Confession, constitutes the foundation of the Church. The Church has nothing to do but to preach this *theologia sacra*, and everything else will turn out properly. Most diligently did primitive Protestantism watch the doings of "fanatics" who saw something more in the faith. There then resulted a stringent Puritanism in religion and in religious pedagogy. It was only this intentional one-sidedness that gave Protestantism the power to accomplish that which she did in history, namely, to reform an old re-

ligion that was rooted deeply in the soil of centuries. The Word alone, and therefore the doctrines alone and the faith alone—these were the battle cry.

The *theologia sacra* in the sense of an infallible Bible doctrine is a thing of the past (*hat sich aufgelöst*). But let us, first, take a glance at the origin of this "theology." It did not exist in this sense from the beginning. Originally there existed in the Church only prophecy and spiritual or "pneumatic" teachings. Whoever spoke in the name of religion did so because impelled by the Spirit, and those who listened were convinced that he was thus moved. But this period in the Church's development did not long continue. In the place of prophecy and pneumatic teachings came a theology based on logical processes of thought such as existed already in reference to the Old Testament. This was the *theologia sacra*, for it was extracted from a *sacred text*—in fact from two, the Old and the New Testaments. A departure from this ideal in such a way that there was claimed for natural reason a certain power to find the truth, was in the early times frowned upon, as is seen in the case of the first great theologian, Origen.

In the Church of the Reformation there was no material change in this regard. All sacred things, to even a greater degree than was the case in Roman Catholicism, are sought after exclusively in the sacred sources, and for that reason the science that seeks to find this truth is the *theologia sacra*. Protestantism even more than Roman Catholicism is built on this foundation. And yet this *theologia sacra* as an absolute system because taken from the inspired Bible Codex, gradually disintegrated. In principle it was soon accepted that some spheres of knowledge were not under the control of theology. This emancipation of science began with the discipline of Church polity, which was soon a purely secular science. Then, too, the literary study of the Old and New Testament books was made independent of dogmatic control. In this way a new principle was introduced into Protestant thought. And how was this accomplished? It resulted from the de-

velopment of the historical principle so long potent in natural sciences, and its adoption in the theological department. The conception of what science was became changed and revolutionized. As a result there has been an emancipation of exegetical, historical, and other theological science from the supremacy of the dogma.

3. In this way it was scientific research that has undermined theology, in the old sense of the word, and deprived theology of its character as "sacred." And yet this was only one factor in this process of disintegration. Another was the Church itself. Within the Church there has been since the days of Schleiermacher a readjustment of the relation between religion and the Church. Not only has there been a skeptical attitude against dogmatical systems, but also against theology itself as a doctrinal and historical knowledge. There was a time when, in Protestantism, the theologians sat in judgment in all Church questions; now they themselves are being judged. There was a time when theology ruled in the Church; now theology is relegated to the rear, or its work is regarded as a *quantité négligeable*—as a fruitless and useless work for the real good of the Church. It is not my purpose to judge of this matter, but only to record facts; and these are the facts. And while theology has, in recent times, submitted to the demands of the principles of scientific research, there have been other agencies at work in the Church which have been very potent in producing a chasm between theology and the Church.

4. And what are these modern agencies? They can be summed up in the words, "the progressive Catholicization of Protestantism." This has been the case, first of all, in reference to the conception of what the Church is. Here the constant tendency has been, in the manner of the Roman Catholic Church, to emphasize the authority of the Church itself, as an organization and as the exponent and expression of a body of doctrines, and of tendencies and trends of thought and life. It is the Church as an *institution* that is ever

made prominent, more in a practical than in a theoretical manner; an institution of majorities, of a system of doctrines, and the like. Men speak of the Church and her prerogatives and powers as they do of the State, and the tone reminds one of a Cyprian and the polemical writer of the Middle Ages. Characteristic of this Catholicizing conception of the Church is the manner in which "heretics" are pursued and Church government is administered, as also the power of fanaticism and similar tendencies in the Church. This Catholicizing tendency is the chief cause of the transformation of the Protestantism of the nineteenth century. The constant emphasis placed on the Confession of the Church, as an ultimatum of appeal and a type of thought, to which strict adherence is demanded, has led to the reproduction of a principle of tradition that is greatly after the manner of the Catholic Church, and in the Protestant Church is even more dangerous, where the personal factor of a supreme authority in the shape of a visible head—such as is the Pope of Rome—is not present. Opposition to the words of a confession is regarded as a resistance to the Church, and a violation of the authority of the Church. The processes of thought are identical with those common and current in the Church of Rome. Hand in hand with these tendencies, we have the efforts in modern Protestantism toward the production of uniformity in worship and in the forms of service. This is a spirit unknown to old Protestantism, and is substantially a liturgical Catholicization of Protestantism. The principle of Christian and ecclesiastical liberty is thereby seriously endangered. In addition to these leading currents of thoughts driving Protestantism Catholicward, there are others of a subordinate character, but all aiming at the same goal.

We have reasons to be grateful to God that there are still factors and forces extant in Protestantism which will prevent un-Protestant consolidation. There are two elements that are still active in the entire domain of Protestantism; one of these is the conviction

that religion at bottom is nothing but a steady sentiment of the heart based on a childlike confidence in God, a firm and joyful trust in God, such as is expressed in the famous hymn of Paul Gerhardt when he says :

" Ist Gott für mich, so trete gleich alles wider mich."

The other factor is this, that the childlike confidence finds its expression in the most simple and elementary system of morals, so that a moral life with all its earnestness is the corollary of religion, without which religion is nothing but superstition and soul deception. These convictions, which have been summed up in the Sermon on the Mount, are the great strength of Protestantism and its hidden treasure, as these without question establish its existence within the Christian Church ; thus too they are the essential contents of the Gospel itself. No matter how much we study the words of Christ, the result in all cases will be the old truth that the essence of the Gospel does not consist in these secondary matters, but in the announcement of the fatherhood of God and of the forgiveness of sins, and in the holy earnestness with which the laws of morality are impressed upon the conscience.

The two fundamental elements of the Christian religion which have here been mentioned still live in our Protestant Churches. They also live in the hearts of our Protestant brethren with whom we theologians are compelled to engage in controversy, therefore it would be a pessimistic and one-sided view that would persuade us to lose our faith in Protestantism. *Impossibile est, ut non laetetur qui sperat in Domino !*

WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES ABOUT THE
HUMAN BODY.BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. DAVID BROWN, D.D., LL.D.,
ABERDEEN.From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh), December, 1896.

IF there is one thing more than another in which the Religion of the Bible differs from all other Religions, it is in the view which it gives of the *human body*. In many heathen countries the common people believe that the body is a mass of matter which at death becomes part of the dust of the ground, and they themselves are no more. The better races, especially of the Northern regions, believe in an immortality, which they shape according to what they believe will be the perfection of happiness; while in the East it is believed that consummate bliss will consist in absorption into Brahm, which, whatever it may mean, certainly means the extinction of our personal identity. In the schools of Greek philosophy the body was regarded as an encumbrance on the soul,—its cage or prison-house which at death will set the spirit free; for the spirit is the man. In short, wherever heathenism reigns, *life* is either regarded as at an end altogether, or it will be a life in which the body will have no part. In both these respects the religion of the Bible stands absolutely alone.

If it is asked what the Old Testament teaches on this subject, the question is not easily answered, for its teaching is chiefly indirect. It is there, but it is in the background; for it was reserved for Christ Himself, the Resurrection and the Life, to bring life and immortality to *light*. But we have our Lord's own authority for saying, what devout Israelites might know from

their own Scriptures, that the dead are to rise. 'Now that the dead are raised,' said He to the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection of the dead, 'even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto Him' (Luke xx. 37, 38). And, in the Psalms, have we not clear enough indications of this? In the 17th Psalm the Psalmist prays to be delivered 'from men of the world, which have their portion in this life,' etc. 'As for me, I shall behold Thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness' (vers. 14, 15; see also Ps. xlix. 14, to the end). And in the 23rd Psalm the Psalmist is assured that 'goodness and mercy shall follow him all the days of his life, and that he shall dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.'

Coming to the prophets, under the figure of a bodily resurrection Ezekiel beheld in vision a valley full of dry bones, 'very many, and very dry,' representing the whole house of Israel, supposed to be hopelessly dead, after the Assyrian captivity of the ten tribes, and the Babylonian captivity of the other two tribes. But, being commanded to prophesy over the bones, they came together, the flesh upon them, and skin and sinews, but without life. Then, being commanded to prophesy to the wind (or breath), behold, breath came into them, and they lived and stood up upon their feet, 'an exceeding great army' (Ezek. xxxvii.). Also in the minor prophets, under the same figure of the resurrection of a *dead Church*, devout Jews were made familiar with the resurrection of the dead. Thus (Hos. vi. 1, 2): 'Come, and let us return unto the Lord: for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up. . . . He will revive us, and the third day He will raise us up; and we shall live in His sight.' Again, in xiii. 14: 'I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction? Re-

penitance shall be hid from mine eyes,'—words which the apostle appropriates and enlarges upon rapturously on the actual resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. xv. 38). In a word, the resurrection of the dead in the person of the promised Messiah is expressly predicted in Psalm xvi. Up to verse 10 it is impossible to doubt that David himself is the speaker as well as the author of the psalm, and that he is expatiating on his happiness in having the Lord for his portion. The lines had fallen to him in pleasant places, and he had a goodly heritage. Not only so, but, looking to his future state, he says: 'My flesh shall rest in hope,'—of what? 'For thou wilt not leave my soul in [or "to"] Hades (*εις ᾅδην*); neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption' (ver. 10). But David's flesh did see corruption. We are therefore forced to conclude that, being a prophet, he was now carried beyond himself, and led to say what was true of none, who ever died or would die, save One, Jesus of Nazareth. That this is no forced interpretation of the verse, *but the genuine sense of it*, is certain, if we are to believe the two apostles, Peter and Paul, rather than our modern critics. What said the Apostle Peter when, on the day of Pentecost, being filled with the Holy Ghost, he addressed the wondering multitude in the streets of Jerusalem? 'Brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath, that of the fruit of his body He would raise up one to sit upon his throne, he, *seeing this before*, spake of the resurrection of the Christ [Messiah], that His soul was not left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption' (Acts ii. 29-31).

To the same effect, and almost in the same terms, does the other great apostle comment on this same verse of the 16th Psalm in his address to the Jews at Antioch, in Pisidia: 'We bring unto you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, how that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that He

raised up Jesus. . . . And as concerning that He raised Him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, He hath spoken in this wise. . . . He saith also in another psalm, Thou wilt not suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had in his own generation served the counsel of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption. But He whom God raised up saw no corruption' (Acts xiii. 32-36). This ought to be decisive, that the 16th Psalm does predict the resurrection of the body, not in the person of David, but of David's Son, the promised Messiah.

Yet, when Christ came, what was the belief on this subject? The Pharisees did believe in the resurrection of the dead as a *doctrine*, but when the apostles began to preach the resurrection of Christ as a *fact*, the Sadducees, who were the ruling party at that time, determined to forbid this teaching, on pain of imprisonment, and, if they persisted in it, to put them to death. 'As they spake to the people, the priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them, being distressed because they taught and preached in Jesus' (R.V.)—not 'through Jesus' (A.V.)—'the resurrection of the dead' (Acts iv. 1, 2). They were not preaching a *doctrine*, but a *fact*; but it was evident to everybody that the one established the other. They must stand or fall together, as the apostle tells the Corinthian Christians (see 1 Cor. xv.).

But it is to our Lord's own teaching, and that of His apostles, about the resurrection of the body, that I wish especially to call attention in the sequel of this paper; and all the more because the Authorized Version fails to bring out, as the Revised Version does, the emphatic way in which He expressed Himself on the subject. 'This,' He says, 'is the will of Him that sent Me, that of *all that* He hath given Me, I should lose *nothing*, but should *raise it up* at the last day' (John vi. 39). Yes, what the Father hath given Him is their whole selves,—not their souls, which are precious, but their whole man; for 'their very dust to

Him is dear.' But in the very next verse (40) the neuter gender is changed to the masculine : ' And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on Him, shall have everlasting life, and I will raise *him* up at the last day.' Again, ' No man can come to Me, except the Father which hath sent Me draw him : and I will raise *him* up at the last day ' (ver. 44). And once more (ver. 54), ' Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life ; and I will raise *him* up at the last day.' In a word, in His last, His longest, His most heavenly intercessory prayer, which He offered at the communion-table but an hour before His agony in the garden and His betrayal by the traitor, we have these remarkable words : ' Father, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee. As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, *that whatsoever Thou hast given Him, to them He should give eternal life* ' (John xvii. 1, 2, R.V.). Here the neuter gender and the masculine are combined, as if to mark by emphatic repetition that the eternal *life* which is given to believers is not mere existence, but their whole redeemed selves, body as well as soul.

I come next to the teaching of the apostles. Was it as emphatic on this point as their Master's? Yes, and they could give us features of the subject which for obvious reasons our Lord could not express. Thus, in the first epistle to the Thessalonians we learn that some of the members of that Church had died, to the grief of their brethren, who supposed, from what the apostle had taught them about the second coming of their Lord—as if it were at the door, that those deceased brethren would miss seeing Him as soon as themselves. Not so, says the apostle to them ; for ' we would not have you to be ignorant concerning them that are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as the rest (the heathen) which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him ' (1 Thess. iv. 13, 14). Mark the studious change of words now

used to express the death of Christ and that of *believers*. Never once is the death of Christ called a *sleep*. If it had been so, those who refused to believe that He had risen again would have been ready to say He had not really died at all; it was only a deep *swoon*, from which He at length awoke. In that case, of course, it was no resurrection from the *dead*. And as the truth of Christianity rests upon the reality of both the *death* and the resurrection of Christ, the use of the word 'sleep' is studiously avoided in speaking of His death. Here, accordingly, the apostle warily changes the word—Jesus *died*, but believers *sleep*. Yes, and best of all, they '*sleep in Jesus*.' That is, their bodies do; but that is themselves. This is grandly expressed by the angel who rolled away the stone from the sepulchre to let the Lord go forth from it alive. The women who had come to anoint the body of their dead Lord were terrified at the sight of the angel. But, 'Fear not ye,' said the angel; 'for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for He is risen as He said. Come, see the place where *the Lord lay*' (Matt. xxviii. 5, 6). Yes, it was Himself who lay there. Mary Magdalene stands at the tomb weeping, and sees two angels in white clothing sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where *the body* of Jesus had lain. 'They say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away *my Lord* out of the sepulchre, and I know not where they have laid Him.' It was His body that lay there; but to Mary it was *her Lord* that lay there. Yes, and He lay in as narrow, and cold, and dark, and repulsive a spot as any of us will have to lie in. And by this He has consecrated and perfumed the very clods of the valley. Beautiful is the way in which God comforted Jacob, when in his old age he had to travel that long journey from Canaan to Egypt in the waggons which Joseph had sent to bring him. On reaching Beersheba, he seems to have feared it might cost him his life. But God appeared to him in the visions of the night, and

said to him : ' Fear not to go down into Egypt ; for *I will go down with thee, and will surely bring thee up again*' (Gen. xlv. 2-4). But Jacob never came up alive from Egypt ; but *his bones* were brought up, and God calls this *himself* (' I will surely bring thee up again'), and a good account of him will be given by Him who said, ' This is the will of Him that sent Me, that of *all that* which He hath given Me I should lose *nothing*, but should raise it up at the last day.'

Ye Thessalonian brethren, fear not that your deceased friends will not get a sight of your Lord as soon as yourselves ; ' Yes, this we say unto you by the word of the Lord ' (a special revelation, as I think—at least, it is nowhere else recorded), ' that we which are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air ; and so shall we ever be with the Lord ' (1 Thess. iv. 13-17).

So much for the teaching of the apostles about the body, and the resurrection of it.

But what the resurrection-body will be we know only from what the apostle teaches in 1 Cor. xv., and this chiefly negative ; but one is glad to get even that, and would fain peer into its full meaning. But two passages which I shall quote seem to throw some light on the subject. ' It is not made manifest what we shall be,' says the beloved disciple ; ' but we know that if He shall be made manifest we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him even as He is ' (1 John iii. 2, R.V.). Then (Phil. iii. 20, 21), ' We look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ ; who shall fashion the body of our humiliation, that it may be *conformed to the body of His glory*.' Taking these passages together, they seem to me to express something very *positive* as to the glorified *human body* of our Lord, ' *even as He is* ' on the throne.

Does the reader, in his still moments, sometimes try to realise to himself what that radiant form, 'the body of His glory,' will be like? I confess I sometimes do. That fine hymn-writer, Ray Palmer, I am sure, did; for thus he sings—

' Jesus, these eyes have never seen
That radiant form of Thine :
The veil of flesh hangs dark between
Thy blessed face and mine.

' I see Thee not, I hear Thee not,
Yet art Thou oft with me ;
And earth hath ne'er so dear a spot
As where I meet with Thee.

' Yet, though I see Thee not, and still
Must rest in faith alone,
I love Thee, dearest Lord, and will,
Unseen but not unknown.

' When death these mortal eyes shall close,
And still this throbbing heart,
The rending veil shall Thee disclose,
All glorious as Thou art.'

But no; he is scarcely right there. It will only be when 'we shall see Him, even as He is,' in 'the body of His glory.' To be at home with the Lord at death is enough in the meantime. But the best is yet to come.

In conclusion, what effect, it may be asked, had this new teaching about the *body* upon the converts from heathenism? It produced a delicacy of feeling about the sins of the body utterly unknown before. Thus to the Ephesian Christians the apostle says: 'Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth' (iv. 29), and (v. 1, 2), 'Be ye therefore followers of God, as beloved children, and walk in love. . . . But fornication and all uncleanness, . . . *let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints,*' as if the very naming of them was defiling to the lips of those who uttered them, and the ears of those who heard them. Only those who have read carefully the works of Ovid

and Horace and Juvenal do realise the vastness of the change which Christianity produced upon the converts from heathenism. Archbishop Trench, in his charming book on the *Synonyms of the Greek Testament*, calls attention to the remarkable fact that the word for *love* in classical Greek (*ἔρως*) is never used in the Greek Testament, because it conveys the idea of *sensual* love. Instead of this, the word used is (*ἀγάπη*), which means that pure love of God to which we owe our salvation (John iii. 16), and that love of man to man which is the fulfilling of the law (1 Cor. xiii.). This word, as a *noun*, is not found in the Greek classics, though the verb (*ἀγαπάω*) does occur.

This sense of delicacy has continued, and so purified the language of Christendom that in respectable society all defiling language is excluded from social intercourse.

In the burial of the dead there was a great difference between the early Christians and the heathens. I remember reading somewhere that in the third century the plague broke out in Alexandria, sparing neither heathens nor Christians. The Christians, dressed in white, walked in procession, singing hymns, and so buried their dead. The pagans, when any of their family died, fled from the house, leaving their dead unburied; while the Christians went to those heathen houses, brought out the dead, carried them on their backs, and buried them, but in silence.

Even to this day the change produced upon the rude heathen by their conversion to Christianity is strikingly to be seen in the matter of dress. A lady friend of mine went out to Zululand to visit her sister, the wife of the medical missionary there, and became so much interested in the work of that mission and its progress that she determined to remain and work in it. After some years she came home to see her friends, and meeting her in Edinburgh, I asked her some questions about the mission. 'Do the women go naked, or do they dress?' 'The heathen women go stark naked, but when they become Christians they clothe them-

selves ;' and she added, ' even the heathen women are learning to put on some covering.'

But of all the effects of the teaching of Christianity about the *human body*, the most remarkable is the building of hospitals and infirmaries for the sick and dying,—sometimes at enormous cost,—and providing them with the best medical officers and appliances, and this in all parts of Christendom—a thing all but unknown till Christianity leavened civilised nations on this subject.

THE temptation to shift responsibility for results to Divine Providence seems to be almost irresistible to many people ; and they constantly charge to that Providence trials and burdens which they have brought on themselves. There is a class of happenings in this world which are beyond the control of the wisest and strongest ; they spring from the order into which we are born, and we have no more to do with them than with the cosmic forces. These happenings are often sorrowful and calamitous ; they bring loss and anguish with them, and when they come we can only bow our heads and say : " Thy will be done." There is, however, a much larger class of happenings which are the fruit of seed of our own sowing ; we, and not Providence, impose these burdens, and are responsible for these trials. We are constantly, however, shirking this kind of responsibility. We neglect sanitation, and when sickness comes, we talk about inscrutable Providence ; we foolishly live at the rate of expense which our incomes do not justify, and then, when debts embarrass and distress us, we rail at the hardness of fortune and count ourselves victims of circumstances ; we fail to deal with practical matters with intelligence and judgment, and when disaster overtakes us, we grow bitter and call the world unjust and harsh. In a thousand ways we refuse to recognize the fruit we are compelled to eat as having grown from the seed we have planted with our hands ; and we lay upon Divine Providence sorrows and trials which we have brought upon ourselves.—*The Churchman*.

"THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS," VOL. IX.¹

BY R. W. MICOU.

From *The Church Standard*, Philadelphia.

WITH the exception of the portions by Clement and Origen, all the material in this volume has been discovered or first printed within a dozen years, and we cannot overestimate the service which the publishers have rendered to general Christian scholarship by thus collecting in convenient form such important specimens of early Christian literature, heretofore only accessible in expensive editions or such monographs as the *Cambridge Texts and Studies*. The volume, however, is not a mere compilation, the translations are made afresh by competent scholars—the Diatessaron, for example, being rendered from the Arabic, not, like Hill's, from the Latin version—and the Introductions are accurate.

No recent *find* is more important for the study of the canon and the text of the New Testament than the Diatessaron of Tatian, a chronological arrangement of the Gospel narrative of our four Evangelists, displaying the greatest care and skill. In the seventies, the author of *Supernatural Christianity* denied its very existence, and though Bishop Lightfoot victoriously defended it, he did not dream that the sceptical attacks upon it would soon be answered by its discovery. But within a decade two Arabic versions came to hand; the one in the Vatican Library, where it had long lain unnoticed, the other sent from Egypt by a Coptic bishop. These are independent manuscripts, and give us substantially the original (Syriac) text, which we can further verify by the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus, which, we now know, followed closely the Diatessaron. Its recovery proves beyond question that by the middle of the second century our four Gospels in their present form were so universally accepted as alone authoritative, that Tatian no more thought of using any other than we should. As Tatian was the friend and pupil

¹ Original supplement to the American Edition containing Gospel of Peter, Diatessaron of Tatian, Apocalypse of Peter, Visio Pauli, Apocalypses of the Virgin and Sedrach, Testament of Abraham, Acts of Zanthippe and Polyxena, Narrative of Zosimus, Apology of Aristides, Epistles of Clement (Complete Text), Origen's Commentary on John, and Commentary on Matthew. The Christian Literature Company.

of Justin Martyr, the long moot question as to whether the latter knew St. John's Gospel is answered in the affirmative. Its value in textual criticism arises from its following the Old Syriac text, used also in the Curetonian fragments and the recently discovered Syriac Gospels. It is also the basis of the interesting Codex Bezaë. It is a most curious fact that the Diatessaron exercised a wide influence in the West through the Latin Harmony of Victor of Capua, which followed it closely.

The Apology of Aristides in a Syriac Version was discovered in the library of the Convent of St. Catherine in Mount Sinai by Rendal Harris in 1889. It is the work of an Athenian philosopher and perhaps the earliest defence of Christianity, being mentioned by Eusebius as belonging to the age of Hadrian, and it bears every mark of an early date. The closing portion, which answers the calumnies of the heathen by appealing to the purity and love displayed in the daily life of the Christians, is worthy of comparison with the eloquent Epistle to Diognetus. He refers the emperor to "the writings" of the Christians for confirmation of his account of their belief and practice, an expression which implies the general acceptance of certain books recognized as authoritative even at that early period. The editor unfortunately gives no examples of what he calls "the echoes of New Testament expressions," but Professor Seeberg, in a recent number of Zahn's *Forschungen*, shows that Aristides made extensive use of the New Testament, including the Pastoral Epistles and the Gospel of St. John. The First Epistle of Clement and the *Didache* were also known to him. Seeberg, like Rendal Harris, thinks that the Apology was presented to Antonius Pius (who was also called Hadrianus), whose reign began A.D. 138, but it is not at all impossible that Eusebius, whose accuracy is being constantly confirmed, may be right in his statement that it was presented to Hadrian on his visit to Athens in 125. The simple points of Christian faith mentioned in Chapter II. accord with the Apostles' Creed, and the explicit recognition of the Virgin Birth is very noteworthy. "The Christians, then, trace the beginning of their religion from Jesus the Messiah; and He is named the Son of God Most High. And it is said that God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew Virgin assumed and clothed himself with flesh; and the

Son of God lived in a daughter of man. This is taught in the Gospel, as it is called, which a short time ago was preached among them."

The number of valuable *finds* in Syriac and Armenian encourages us to hope that whenever similar attention is given to Abyssinia other lost Christian writings may be discovered, for Abyssinian Christianity dates back to the third century, and was never interrupted by Mohammedan conquest.

Of less importance, but still of interest, are the fragments of the so-called Gospel and Revelation of Peter, which were found in a Christian tomb in Egypt in 1886. Both are frequently mentioned in early writers among the Apocryphal books which circulated in certain regions, especially in the East. The fragment of the Gospel embraces the passion, death and resurrection of Christ. It differs widely from our Evangelists, but the language and the order of events agree so closely with them that scholars agree that it is not a primitive or original work, but is based on our Gospels, especially St. John's. Harnack thinks that the writer knew our four Gospels, but "he did not distil his docetic Gospel out of them, but rather, as seems to me, he used such recollections of Him as seemed to him fitting for his purpose and added other features, drawn from other traditions." The introduction by Mr. Rutherford is brief and hardly satisfactory, but a synoptical table is given which enables the reader to make his own comparison with the evangelists. Harnack puts it early in the second century, A.D. 140 at latest; Armitage Robinson, and others, much later in the same century.

The other Apocryphal writings, such as "The Vision of Paul," "The Testament of Abraham," "The Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena," are of a different class, being specimens of the religious fictions within the Church, in which many readers, then as now, delighted. We do not know how far they represent the popular belief; but a group of them, including some here published, are noticeable for their earnest intercession for sinners and hope of salvation apparently for the lost. How the teachers of the Church felt about them may be judged from Augustine's words: "There have been some vain individuals who with a presumption that betrays the grossest igno-

rance have forged a Revelation of Paul, crammed with all manner of fables, which has been rejected by the Orthodox Church, affirming it to be the vision in which he said he heard unspeakable words not lawful for man to utter."

"The Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena" also treat of St. Paul on the basis that he preached in Spain. It may be as early as the third century, and is interesting as showing the part devout women played in the spread of the Gospel. The story is full of incidents with many characters.

"The Testament of Abraham" seems to have been known more in the East than in the West, as we have versions of it in Ethiopic and Arabic. It belongs to the class of Apocalyptic literature, and in its first form was probably Jewish. Mr. James, who edited the Greek text for the first time in 1892, thinks "that it embodies legends older than that century and received its present (Christianized) form in the ninth or tenth century."

"The Passion of the Scillitan Martyrs" is an undoubted historic document. The martyrs, seven men and five women, laid down their lives for the Lord on the 17th July, 180, and this account may be contemporaneous. It is pathetic in its brevity and stern simplicity. One by one they confessed their faith, and the judge, with manifest reluctance, condemned them to death. "Saturnius the Pro-consul read out the decree from the tablet: 'Speratus, Nartzalus, Cittinus, Donata, Vestia Secunda and the rest having confessed that they live according to the Christian rite, since, after opportunity offered them of returning to the custom of the Romans, they have obstinately persisted, it is determined that they be put to the sword.' Speratus said: 'We give thanks to God.' Nartzalus said: 'To-day we are martyrs in heaven: thanks be to God.' They all said: 'Thanks be to God.' And so they all together were crowned with martyrdom; and they reign with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen."

The commentaries on St. Matthew and St. John are typical specimens of Origen's Biblical writings which had such wide influence in the East and will be welcome to many who admire the spiritual faith of the great teacher, however much they may dislike his allegorical Exegesis.

CURRENT THOUGHT.

Men of One Idea.

WE know that there is a tendency to ridicule men of one idea, but this grows out of one-idea-ism being pushed too far, until it has reached the "hobby" stage or lapses into monomania. But history and experience show that it is men of intense and single purpose, men who say with Paul, "This one thing I do," who accomplish the work of the world, amass wealth, attain to prominence in the professions, enlarge the boundaries of knowledge, and extend and fortify the kingdom of Christ upon the earth. The pulpit of to-day needs to learn this lesson. Instead of following Paul's example, and knowing only "Christ and Him crucified," too many ministers are preaching almost everything but the Gospel. The result is empty churches, increased worldliness, languishing missionary enterprises, a growing disrespect for the preacher and his vocation. The Gospel is as mighty to save as in Paul's day, and the world is now ready to receive the good news of salvation, it proclaimed with the earnestness and zeal of the great Apostles.

Just now there seems to be a widespread desire for a general revival movement in the churches, and the signs of hopefulness about it are the emphasis put upon the Bible, and the disposition to return to the old method of preaching the Gospel. If the ministry everywhere will make Paul's determination their own, we may hope for an outpouring of the Spirit like that of the Pentecostal day.—*The Examiner*, N. Y. (Bapt.).

Creeds.

CREEDS have always been under fire, and probably always will be, until all believers "know as they are known." And, indeed, with regard to the question of the degree to which credal construction can or should be carried, opinions may naturally be expected to differ. There is no one church so œcumenical as to be able to say with absolute authority to all Christendom: "Your creed both as regards extent and content must be precisely so much and this much!" In the exercise of a broad and yet just charity, something must be conceded, unless the Reformation itself is to be reformed to individual differences of interpretation of the minor matters of revelation. But a limit must be set somewhere to the extension of this notion of "minor matters" to the doctrines of the Bible. Not all teachings by any means can be put upon a kind of theological free list, exempt from duty to certain eternal standards of judgment. No religious system can sustain itself long in the world as a broadly and deeply helpful fact that consists entirely of "unessentials," and scarcely at all of essentials. There must be some major matters in every religion or the whole thing will prove to be a very systemless system and a decidedly minor historic factor. The line must be drawn somewhere. And the fight might as well be a sharply defined conflict over a definite creed of moderate proportions, as a promiscuous *mêlée* of forces contending in the vacuum of no creed and all "credos!"—*The Observer*, N. Y. (Pres.).

Rome's Attitude.

IF the Roman Church in America is to settle back again upon its old lines, those who have been in dread of its encroachments in this country may dismiss their fears. Rome arraying itself in the garments of nationality and patriotism, and cultivating relations of sympathy with American ideas and aspirations, might indeed make some headway among our people, and in time become a formidable power in the land. But Rome clinging to its old foreign guise and aspect, and maintaining the character of an alien camp, dominated by a foreign despotism, among a people with whom it disdains to come into congenial touch, can arouse no reasonable apprehension. Such a policy, if steadily pursued, can only result in failure, for not only is it incapable of conciliating the native population, but it cannot maintain the hold of the Church upon the descendants of its own people as they become assimilated to the environment of their adopted country.—*The Living Church*, Chicago (P. E.).

Mr. Herbert Spencer and Christian Dogma.

THE publication by Mr. Herbert Spencer of the concluding volume of his "Synthetic Philosophy" is a matter of more than passing interest to everybody. Ten years ago his health collapsed, and left him powerless to pursue his great work for four years. In 1891 he published his "Justice," being Part IV. of the "Principles of Ethics," Parts II. and III. having been passed over from the fear that he would never live to write them or Parts V. and VI. His fears, however, have been belied, and he has been able to complete the walls and put on the coping-

stone to his imposing system of thought. It would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to parallel so gigantic a feat as that performed by Mr. Herbert Spencer. He has in ten volumes, comprising one on First Principles, two on Biology, two on Psychology, three on Sociology, and two on Ethics, endeavored through thirty-six strenuous years to unify human knowledge. The influence he has exerted thereby on modern thought has been enormous. Not only in this country, but in every civilized country his works have left a deep mark on men's modes of thinking, and his influence now is perhaps all the greater because unconsciously felt. His philosophy has been absorbed into our intellectual veins, and so become part of all our mental activity. It is, or course, another question whether the germs he has so industriously scattered are noxious or beneficent, whether they ought not to be supplemented sometimes by others of a higher order, and sometimes rejected as dangerous to man's spiritual life.

There are two points of Mr. Spencer's teaching which we would select as affording evidence of the danger threatened by his whole system to Christian thought. One is the basis of his ethics, and the other of his theology. It is significant that in his "Preface to Justice," published in 1891, he drew attention to a difference of treatment between that and his "Social Statics," published in 1850: "What there was in my first book of supernaturalistic interpretation," he writes, "has disappeared, and the interpretation has become exclusively naturalistic—that is, evolutionary." Again, in the same volume, he leaves us in no doubt as to what he thinks ethics is: "Most people regard the subject-matter of Ethics as being conduct con-

sidered as calling forth approbation or reprobation. But the primary subject-matter of Ethics is conduct considered objectively as producing good or bad results to self or others or both." This is an explicit statement of what he constantly insists on—viz., that the utilitarian view of morals is the only view he considers philosophically sound. Not only, he maintains, do people always act with pleasure in prospect, but they cannot act from any other motive. The Christian teacher will have no difficulty in recognizing at once the incompatibility of this groundwork of Ethics with that laid down by the New Testament. In that right is not what happens to produce pleasurable results, whether here or hereafter, but what has its root in the very Being of God, and what is, therefore imposed on man as his rule of action because it is his privilege to be made in the image and likeness of God. That the choice of right, and the doing of duty are followed by pleasure of so high a kind as to demand a specific name, that of happiness, is an accident, a beneficent condition attached to right conduct, not of its essence. To follow right, in scorn of consequence, is what the Christian recognizes he *ought* to do. It is precisely what Mr. Spencer protests he *cannot* do. Moreover, it is obvious that in the "Synthetic Philosophy" there is no place left for sin. In its view sin has no existence, but prudential conduct takes its place. Sin is lawlessness, says St. John; sin is only a theological name for folly, says Mr. Spencer.

The same contradiction of Christian dogma appears when we inquire what Mr. Spencer thinks of God. It is some comfort to find that he is too robust a thinker, too little a dreamer of

day-dreams, to lend any countenance to the pantheistic system of thought. He is neither pantheist, atheist, nor materialist. But he is an agnostic. All knowledge he holds is relative, it deals only with phenomena as its subject-matter. Of that which lies behind all phenomena, the mighty Force which manifests itself now in the dewdrop, now in the whirlwind, and now in saintly endeavor, Mr. Spencer professes his blank ignorance. It is there, but we know not what it is. It exists, but its nature is veiled. We can only call it the Great Unknowable. This in its turn is flatly opposed to the Christian truth, as luminous as it is strengthening, that God, whom no man hath seen or can see, has revealed Himself in the God-man. Does Mr. Spencer think that the Great Unknowable is more adequately conceived as blind Force defying analysis, than as a lofty Personality inviting admiration and love? Are we not bound to think of God, since we cannot but think of Him somehow, as being the highest thing we know—*pro nihil majus cogitari potest*, to quote Anselm's phrase, and not as something lower than the highest? And is not a perfect Personality such as that incarnated in Jesus Christ infinitely higher than even irresistible Force, working no matter how uniformly? Mr. Spencer, of course, puts aside the question as unphilosophical, and retorts that we know nothing of higher and lower, but only of greater and less pleasure. He has also a supreme contempt for personality when compared with abstractions. In his "Study of Sociology" he writes:

"If you want roughly to estimate any one's mental calibre, you cannot do it better than by observing the ratio of generalities

to personalities in his talk—how far simple truths about individuals are replaced by truths abstracted from numerous experiences of men and things."

Well, the criterion is false. People, even educated people, talk about other people, not because they are in the amorphous stage of intellectual development, but because human feelings about human beings will always interest them more than the binomial theorem or Kepler's laws. The Christian doctrine of the Fatherhood of God will always, even in the highest development of mankind, when men take to the "Synthetic Philosophy" as babies to their feeding bottles, be truer to their knowledge and their feelings than an impotent assertion of the Unknowableness of the Supreme Something. Men are so made that they cannot live on the east wind.

To sum up. Mr. Spencer's philosophy is inadequate to express the whole truth of human life just because its facts are limited to the sphere of nature. What can be learned, he says, from the microscope, the scalpel, and the blow-pipe are facts for science to co-ordinate. What is breathed into the soul of man from on high, the sense of duty, the longing for perfection, the hatred of evil, the vision of the ideal, are idols of the den. They belong to the emotions, and the emotions are enemies to exact thought. The bias of class-feeling, of theology, of patriotism, of education, is to be eliminated before knowledge is possible. But we should like to ask how much, not only of motive power, but how much of the beauty and the worth of life is left, when a "Gerund-grinder," a machine for turning out valid syllogisms, has been substituted for a human being breathing out

love, invigorated by the keen air of duty, and upborne on wings of faith and hope into the air that surrounds the eternal hills? There is little recognition in the "Synthetic Philosophy" of the dignity and usefulness of the emotions. "Emotion of every kind and degree disturbs the intellectual balance."

No wonder, then, that the religious emotion, so persistent and so generally prevalent though it be, finds no room in Mr. Spencer's philosophy. It does not seem to have occurred to him that an emotion of this sort is not a mere distortion, but the effect of a Cause which is always present, always acting. The absence of any sufficient recognition of this must be the greatest blot on a system of thought, however else admirable for its consistency and lucidity and painful elaboration.

The clergy would do well to study the "Synthetic Philosophy," and to have a firm grasp of its leading principles. It is quite certain that they cannot otherwise deal effectively with modern indifference and unbelief. The most dangerous, because the most able, and the most widely read, opponent of fundamental Christian doctrine is Mr. Herbert Spencer. To be neutralized he must be understood, and to be understood he must be read.—*The Church Times, London* (Anglican).

Mr. Moody and Revivals.

WHILE Mr. Moody lives and draws large audiences there will not be wanting proof that people are not tired of Gospel sermons. Mr. Moody preaches the Gospel. There is no doubt about that. He sets forth the fact of sin as uncompromisingly as John the Baptist, and the fact of salvation for the re-

pendant as confidently as Paul or any of the Apostles. His style is homely, but direct. He is sometimes brusque, but he never fails to win. There are few men who have as much power to force a truth upon the convictions. His points cut their way to the heart by their keenness, and he enforces them by a wealth of illustration which leaves no possible chance for confusion. This kind of preaching should not be left to evangelists. It may not be regarded as the highest and most correct style of pulpit work. It is not so smooth and polished, not so dignified and rhetorical as sermons termed grand, splendid, magnificent, but it is apt to be more effective with the masses. It is the masses which we need to reach. The church is weakest among those with whom it should be strongest. May it not be partly because the sermons are too imaginative, too speculative, too rhetorically refined? There is a rugged strength in Mr. Moody's sermons which grips the mind as with hooks of steel, where the smooth periods of elegant discourse flow like unimpeded water through a sluice.—*The Independent*, N. Y. (Undenom.).

If the right kind of praying is a prelude to a genuine revival, the right kind of preaching is of vast moment also. The men who led in those seasons of great spiritual quickening that Dr. Storrs refers to were not afraid to preach the exceeding sinfulness of sin and its just retributions as well as the wondrous love of God in redemption. The thunders of Sinai and the loving invitations of Calvary were both made audible in their trenchant sermons. Such preaching made thorough work. The surfaces of men's hearts and consciences were not merely scratched over with cultured es-

says about Christianity; the Gospel plough was thrust down deep into the lower strata of human hearts and their nethermost convictions of divine truth; and when souls were converted, their eternal hopes were bottomed on the base-rock. Sinners were not only invited to come to Jesus, but were told *why* they should come and *how* they should come, and that unless they left their darling sins behind them the Saviour would not accept them. Bear in mind that it was this style of heart-piercing presentation of the Gospel by the Apostle Peter which produced the glorious harvest of converts in Jerusalem. That was a typical revival; earnest praying and earnest preaching were attended by a powerful outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Why not now? Whether this style of preaching would be popular now, or whether it would suit the cultured taste of the times and the prevailing "secularism," are questions with which Christ's ministers and churches have nothing to do.—*The Evangelist*, N. Y. (Pres.).

In the old days, there would often be a large number of conversions in a revival, and then perhaps for five or ten years a church would have scarce a single accession. There is a current opinion in the churches now that that is not the best way, and they desire, through the ordinary ministry of the Word and through the Sunday-school instruction, to bring their hearers into the Church. Not only do they believe in conversions, but their success is greater than it ever has been before in the history of the Church. Every one knows how low was the condition of religion at the beginning of the century in this country. Only about 1 to 14.5 of the inhabitants was a communicant; a New England town

of one thousand inhabitants might not have a church-membership of more than twenty or thirty. According to the statistics in Dr. Dorchester's "Problem of Religious Progress," the ratio of Protestant Evangelical communicants to the population of this country was, in 1850, 1 to 6.57 inhabitants; in 1870, 1 to 5.78; in 1880, 1 to 5, and in 1890, 1 to 4.53. The increase would be much more impressive if his figures included the Catholic communicants. We have as good reason to believe that the church-membership of the present day represents converted people as we had that such was the fact thirty or fifty or one hundred years ago.—*The Independent*, N. Y. (Udenom.).

Nature of God and Man.

BECAUSE we believe that God is a Person it is not necessary to infer that we conceive of Him as a great man, and that we do not do so should be readily inferred from the doctrine of the Trinity. We do not profess to know anything about the personality of God. We know that He reveals Himself as tri-personal, and that as such He is the Father, the Redeemer, and the Sanctifier. But His infinite attributes, we fully confess, are all beyond our comprehension. We do not know how He can be omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent; and no created intelligence ever can know, because it would require the possession of these attributes in order to comprehend them. But we are given, and can enjoy, the faith that there are no limitations upon His knowledge and power to usward; that we can approach Him with the same love and confidence which we have for, and in, a very good earthly father; that we can place ourselves confidently in His hands as our Redeemer, and that we can

ask Him for guidance and enlightenment and for moral and spiritual purification and uplift, as our Sanctifier. This gives us a home with and in God—shelter and safety. Having these we are not discouraged nor distressed because we cannot comprehend Him, nor understand His glorious manifestations in revelation, nature, and providence. It is only of late that science has taught us something about the constitution of the sun, and of the means by which he reaches us with his beams; but men basked in them, and enjoyed their bounties upon the fruitful earth, as happily before science disclosed these mysteries as they do now. We can reply to inquiries about God by answering that we do not know, and yet have in certainty the fact more important to us than all other facts, which enables us to say: "I know that my Redeemer liveth."—*The Interior*, Chicago (Pres).

WE hear much of the divinity that is in man. But this coming of Christ to the earth reveals something besides that; it reveals what Dr. Van Dyke has well called "the human life of God." It shows in God Himself a humanness that links Him to us, and so links us to Him. To say that God made man in His image is also to say that God is in man's image. If the babe is the image of his father, then the father is like the babe. This truth is implied in our faith in the Incarnation. There is a humanity in the Infinite and the Eternal; a humanity so essential to Him, so vital in Him that He can lay aside all wondrous power, all marvellous wisdom, empty Himself, beggar Himself, to use Paul's figures, and come and dwell a man among men, and still be the essential God. For the essential in God

and the essential in man are one ; and though the one circle be infinite and the other finite, the centre of both is the same. There is not a little child to-day that, when he thinks of God, may not think of him who played on the earth a little boy, who longed for education but could not have it, and who went home with all those supernal aspirations stirring in him, to be obedient to a peasant mother, and in that very act of obedience to love revealing the heart of the Almighty and the Eternal. It is not strange that men doubt the Incarnation ; it is rather strange that they believe it ; believe that the Infinite and the Eternal, He who launched the worlds upon their courses and holds them in their places—that He is so human that He has been able to walk the world as a man seen of men, and handled of men, and talked with by men. Do any of us really believe this divine interpretation of the human life of God?—*The Outlook, N. Y.* (Undenon.).

Preachers and Preaching.

WE dissent *in toto* from the implication that ministers of generous culture are not needed in the churches to-day. One reason why more men are not found in our churches to-day is that too much of the preaching lacks mental strength. The appeal of the Gospel is not presented to them with the same mental grasp of the facts with which political or business appeals are constantly presented. An earnest evangelical spirit is not the only factor for successful preaching, though without it all else is vain. With it you cannot have too much mental discipline and culture. It is an enormous gain when a congregation feels that it is in the presence not only of a good man, but of a good

man who in knowledge and mental power is a master. Quite a number of semi-religious stories have lately been published, showing the power that young ministers have gained over young men by their skill in various athletic games. Why may not a minister gain power over men by the superiority of his mental discipline and culture? Certainly he does. And there is this advantage that the minister cannot take his tennis racket or football into the pulpit, but he cannot leave his mental equipment outside of it. It is there winning respect for him any way. The argument that uncultivated persons should have the Gospel preached to them in their vernacular cuts both ways. If it is necessary to put the Gospel in rough and sometimes coarse forms to reach the ignorant and coarse, why by a parity of reasoning should not the Gospel be put in the forms of cultivated speech to reach the educated and refined? The argument is just as good on the one side as on the other.—*The Watchman, Boston* (Bapt.).

ON the subject of lay evangelization it is idle to say that what a man *must* do by his whole life, he *ought not* to do by word of mouth. Common sense rebels against the notion, which is without warrant of Holy Scripture, that the work of evangelization by preaching the Gospel with the living voice is a peculiar prerogative of any order in the Church, however sacred. We are told that the ordained man preaches by authority : so he does, but so does every Christian man. There was no doubt on that point in apostolic times. When Saul "made havoc of the Church, entering into every house and haling men and women to prison," not only apostles and elders and deacons, but all in gen-

eral who "were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word," and no one fancied *then* that they preached without authority. They preached of necessity. That very scattering abroad and the unofficial preaching of the dispersed disciples was one of the means by which Almighty God overruled the rage of the persecutor to the spreading of the Gospel.—*The Church Standard*, Phila. (P. E.).

THERE always have been, and probably there always will be, two types of ministers, those whose strength lies in organization and those who spiritualize and inspire. Occasionally we find both of these gifts conferred upon the same person, but not often. In these days, when the organizing spirit has received a new impulse, the minister who is gifted with executive ability has a new opportunity. It is his pride and his privilege to build up the institution. He may not shine as a preacher, but he may put a brick

in here and a brick in there, and may see the steady growth of the organization which he is trying to build. On the other hand, there are ministers, who are devoid of this organizing power. They may gather a church around their personality, but it is not likely to exist after they have gone. Remove the magnetism of their presence, and it goes to pieces. Let neither type of man nor work be undervalued. There is a place for the church carpenters and bricklayers, whose work shall live after them in the institutions they build. There is need, too, of those atmospheric influences radiating from personality which warm and vivify and profoundly influence human lives, and thus influence and mould generations which are to come. We need not ask what visible memorial a minister has left, when the spiritual thermometer shows that he has raised the temperature of life; for that means the budding germ and the ripening fruit.—*The Christian Register*, Boston (Unit.).

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLET, LIBRARIAN OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ST. PAUL, THE TRAVELLER AND THE ROMAN CITIZEN.

By W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1895; New York: Putnam, 1896. 8vo. Pp. xvi. + 390.

It is an interesting fact that the two men who in the last five years have made the most notable contributions to the study of the Book of Acts, and thus of the apostolic age, are scholars who had first distinguished themselves in classical studies, and who are still to be reckoned officially among classicists rather than among

theologians. For this incursion into their domain of such a scholar as Blass, with his wide and thorough knowledge of classical literature and of the literary methods of the Græco-Roman world, and of such a one as Ramsay, with the equipment which prolonged geographical and archæological studies in Asia Minor have given him, all New Testament specialists must be grateful, however difficult they may find it to accept all the suggestions of these scholars. For if there is anything that New Testament scholarship needs more than that *sine qua non* spiritual insight, it is a broadening of its historical basis. Especially is this true in the study of the Book of Acts and the apostolic age. From a historical point of view, the problem of Acts might be said to be almost the central problem of New Testament study. Establish the character of that book, show whether it is a second century historical romance, or a patchwork of fragments awkwardly put together, or a first-class historical work of the first century, and you will have gone far toward drawing and measuring a base line from which a survey of the whole area of the New Testament period and the New Testament literature may be successfully made. But alike for the interpretation of this record and for the determination of its historical value, there is needed the fullest and most accurate knowledge possible of the conditions, political, social, religious, and commercial, which prevailed in the various parts of the Roman Empire in the first century. Mere general knowledge of the state of the Roman Empire at large is not sufficient. Not only were the conditions different in different parts of the empire, but frequent changes took place, so that one who would understand and estimate a record like that of the Acts needs for his task a very detailed knowledge of the state of affairs in different parts of the empire and of the changes which took place in the first century.

In the work before us, Professor Ramsay has undertaken to give an interpretation of Acts so far as it pertains to Paul from the vantage ground of the knowledge of the condition of the empire, particularly of con-

ditions in Asia Minor, which he has acquired by years of study, including painstaking exploration of the interior of that peninsula. He tells us frankly at the outset what his conclusion is. His working hypothesis, which is, however, evidently to him a great deal more than an hypothesis, "is that Acts was written by a great historian, a writer who set himself to record the facts as they occurred, a strong partisan indeed, but raised above partiality by his perfect confidence that he had only to describe the facts as they occurred in order to make the truth of Christianity and the honor of Paul apparent." This hypothesis does not exclude the use of sources by the author. Ramsay maintains that the writer of Acts had such sources, not all of equal value, indeed, but that, being himself a personal friend and disciple of the apostle Paul, he not only possessed a first-hand knowledge of much that he relates, but had access also, in matters of which he was not an eye-witness, to the best sources, and was able to "control" all his sources by the knowledge thus obtained. Ramsay's method as a whole may be said to be to interpret the testimony of the Acts concerning Paul's life on this hypothesis and to test the correctness of the hypothesis and the interpretation by the consistency of the result with itself and with those facts, concerning the condition of the countries in which Paul worked, which have been established by archæological and other historical investigations. If it often seems to the reader that he assumes as the basis of his interpretation the very hypothesis which his book is to establish, it is fair to remember what his method is and to recognize its entire legitimacy.

The leading characteristic of Ramsay's work is its suggestiveness. The fresh point of view which his archæological studies have given him enable him to free himself from the trammels of traditional interpretations, and to see things from a new angle of vision. The result is sometimes startling to one accustomed to the old views, sometimes a trifle provoking, always suggestive and stimulating. In its whole method of attacking the problem, this book is a departure from

that for which Baur set the fashion. Instead of beginning with the Pauline letters, determining which of these are genuine, and then basing the criticism of Acts on an interpretation of the letters, Ramsay treats the Acts as a primary source of information, tests it rather by external archæological information than by the letters of Paul, and though employing the latter, treats them as supplementary rather than as primary and governing sources. This method, which, of course, Ramsay has not been the first to employ, has decided advantages. It simplifies the problem and brings to bear upon it those evidences which are most objective and least liable to be distorted by prejudice. It raises the question whether the two sides of the problem might not be advantageously still further separated; whether we are not nearly ready for two lives of Paul, one based on Acts, without assistance or embarrassment from the letters, and another based wholly on the letters; these two then to be treated as independent sources for the complete biography of the apostle.

With Ramsay's South Galatian view, and its basis in the Acts and its influence on his interpretation of the book, scholars are already familiar through his "Church in the Roman Empire" and his articles in the *Expositor*. The present work adds another scarcely less startling departure from current views. Think of the confusion into which our chronology of Paul's life is thrown by making Acts 22 : 17ff, as well as Gal. 2 : 1-10 refer to the same visit to Jerusalem as Acts 11 : 30 and 12 : 25 ! What Ramsay says about the nature of the mission described in these latter passages is deeply interesting and must be duly weighed. Possibly we shall yet be persuaded that he is as nearly right here as in reference to the Galatian churches. But the present writer is compelled to confess that, aside from his arguments based on the necessary character of a relief expedition in the first century, Ramsay's defence of this particular view seems extremely weak. The axioms on which it rests are far from being axiomatic, and nearly every argument urged by him against the older view might with mere substitution of phrases be em-

ployed with more effect against him than in his defence. In several other points of less importance also we are constrained to believe that Ramsay's suggestions are more startling than convincing. But no dissent from his views on matters great or matters small can prevent our recognizing that Professor Ramsay has by this book placed all students of the apostolic age under obligation to him. His vivid presentation of the condition of affairs in the interior of Asia Minor—he is at his best, perhaps, in Chapter VI.—and his brilliant suggestions are both received with gratitude, which is only abated, not destroyed, by the fact that we are compelled to reject some of these latter. If any one wishes to see the final word on the Book of Acts and the life of Paul, we do not recommend this book. If any one wishes stimulus, suggestion and information, and knows how to discriminate, and hold in abeyance for further testing what a writer gives, he will find this volume most helpful.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

University of Chicago.

SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS RECORD.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Meth. R. So.	Methodist Review, South. (Quarterly.)
Am. Cath. Q. R.	American Catholic Quarterly Review.	Miss. H.	Missionary Herald.
Bapt. Q.	Baptist Quarterly Review.	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
Bib. Sac.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	New Chr. Q.	New Christian Quarterly.
Bib. W.	Biblical World.	New W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
Can. M. R.	Canadian Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	Our D.	Our Day.
Char. R.	Charities Review.	Prot. Ep. R.	Protestant Epis. Review.
Chr. L.	Christian Literature.	Pre. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Church Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	Presb. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Ex.	Expositor.	Presb. Ref. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	Ref. Q.	Reformed Quarterly Review.
Hom. R.	Homiletic Review.	Sunday M.	Sunday Magazine.
Luth. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	Treas.	The Treasury.
Luth. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.	Yale R.	The Yale Review. (Quarterly.)
Meth. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)		

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the December number of periodicals.

Alexander, Cecil Frances. (S. A. Wallis) Prot. Ep. R.

American Christianity. (L. W. Bacon) Chr. L.

- Archbishops**, Two. (F. W. Farrar) Chr.L.
"As unknown and yet well known." (R. A. Watson) Chr.L.
Augustine and the Pelagian controversy. (B. B. Warfield) Chr.L.
Biblical critics on the warpath. (A. H. Sayce) Chr.L.
Bimetallism, International. (F. A. Walker; H. W. Farnam) YaleR.
 (Nov.).
Brazil, Missionary in. (G. L. Bickerstaph) Treas.
Bridgman, Henry Martyn. Miss.H.
Buhl's new geography of Palestine, and certain geographical problems. (G. A. Smith) Ex.
Butler, Bishop, Gladstone and. (R. A. Armstrong) NewW.
Carlyle, Thomas. (T. W. Hunt) Treas.
Children, Christianity and. (C. R. Henderson) Bib.W.
Children, Religious consciousness of. (M. W. Calkins) NewW.
Christ, Birth of. (G. B. F. Hallock) Treas.
Christ-child Jesus in painting. (W. C. Wilkinson) Bib.W.
Christ, Story of the birth of. (G. T. Purves) Bib.W.
Christ was born, When. Pre.M.
Christ's attitude to His own death. (A. M. Fairbairn) Ex.
Christ's birth, Date of. (C. Geikie) Hom.R.
Christendom, Twentieth century call to. Miss.R.
Christianity and children. (C. R. Henderson) Bib.W.
Christmas, Ananias of Shirak upon. (F. C. Conybeare) Chr.L.
Christmas meditation. (A. MacLaren) Pre.M.
Chronicles, Midrashic element in. (W. E. Barnes) Ex.
Church membership, Necessity of. (W. W. Lance) Meth.R.
Coins, ancient, Educational functions of. (F. M. Bristol) Meth.R.
Conversion, An interesting. (R. Radcliffe) Miss.R.
Economic and social legislation, Recent, in the United States. (F. J. Stimson) YaleR. (Nov.).
Education, Christian, in China. (G. S. Miner) Miss.R.
Egypt, American mission in. Miss.R.
England, Religious movements in. (F. Brown) NewW.
Evolution, Three great epochs of world. (H. W. Conn) Meth.R.
Fairbank, Dr., Semi-centennial of the arrival of. (R. A. Hume) Miss.H.
Fall of man a stage of human evolution. (W. D. Hyde) Treas.
Fiction, Studies in recent. (F. S. Townsend) Meth.R.
Gideon, Story of. (M. G. Pearse) Pre.M.
Gladstone and Bishop Butler. (R. A. Armstrong) NewW.
Gold and the prices of the products of the farm. (L. G. Powers) YaleR. (Nov.).
Heredity, Vicarious: a reading of the child massacre in Bethlehem. (W. W. Peyton) Ex.
Heretics. (W. F. Adeney) NewW.
H Ezekiah to Manasseh, Transition from. (J. F. McCurdy) Hom.R.
Housing effort, Half a century of improved, by the New York Society for improving the condition of the poor. (W. H. Tolman) YaleR. (Nov.).
Human body, What the Bible teaches about the. (D. Brown) Ex.T.
Individuality, Principle of moral, in Catholic Christianity. (G. Frommel) NewW.

SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS. 351

- Incarnation:** a study of Philippians ii. 5-11. (E. H. Gifford) Chr.L.
Institutional church, Symposium on the. (C. L. Thompson) Hom.R.
Isaiah, Child prophecies of. (W. R. Harper) Bib.W.
Jesuits. (G. H. Schodde) Treas.
Jesus, Homeland of. (W. Wright) Ex.
Jewish family life. (E. D. Burton) Bib.W.
Jewish question. (D. Baron) Miss.R.
Jews in Palestine and Syria. (J. M. Gray) Miss.R.
Jews returning to Palestine. (R. S. Moncrieff) Miss.R.
Job, Book of. (K. Budde) Ex.T.
Language as a fine art. (F. B. Cowgill) Meth.R.
Legislation in England, Recent. (E. Porritt) YaleR. (Nov.).
Liberal Christian churches of America, Tendencies of thought in the. (S. M. Crothers) NewW.
Liturgical developments of New Testament times. (J. L. Reeder) Meth.R.
Luke i. 5-ii., Integrity of. (F. P. Badham) Ex.T.
Marshman, Hannah: first woman missionary. (G. Smith) Miss.R.
Medical missionary, Notes from the diary of a. (M. P. Eddy) Miss.R.
Midrashic element in Chronicles. (W. E. Barnes) Ex.
Ministry, Christian, Bishop Lightfoot and the. (S. Crockett) Prot. Ep.R.
Missions, Crisis in. (A. H. Bradford) Chr.L.
Missions, Educational. (J. Lendrum) Miss.R.
Missions, Permanent basis of. (A. T. Pierson) Miss.R.
Music, Concerning an ear for. (C. C. Converse) Hom.R.
Nazareth, Home of our Lord's childhood. (G. A. Smith) Bib.W.
Packard, Dr. J. Recollections of a long life. Prot.Ep.R.
Palestine, Jews returning to. (R. S. Moncrieff) Miss.R.
Paul as a preacher. (W. C. Wilkinson) Hom.R.
Peking University, Chinese literati. (M. L. Taft) Meth.R.
Pelagian controversy, Augustine and the. (B. B. Warfield) Chr.L.
Pessimism, Infection of. (G. Batchelor) NewW.
Poetry, Study of, by the preacher. (J. O. Murray) Hom.R.
Prayer, Success in. (D. L. Moody) Treas.
Ramsay, Professor, Reply to. (E. Schürer) Ex.
Religion, Testimony of Christian students of nature in favor of. (J. W. Dawson) Hom.R.
Religious movements in England. (F. Brown) NewW.
Semites, Oldest history of the. (F. Hommel) Ex.T.
Shakespeare, Absence of religion in. (G. Santayana) NewW.
Shinto pantheon. (E. Buckley) NewW.
Socialism and the New Testament. (D. H. Wheeler) Meth.R.
"Sojourners' Society of Christian Endeavor" of Ku-liang. (C. E. Chittenden) Miss.H.
Storrs, Richard S., Jubilee of. (T. L. Cuyler) Chr.L.
Sunday-school and its relation to the home. (M. Dods) Treas.
Taxes, Shifting of. (T. N. Carver) Yale R. (Nov.).
Thought, Tendencies of, in the liberal Christian churches of America. (S. M. Crothers) NewW.
When this world is not. (H. W. Warren) Meth.R.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union and its branches. (F. A. B. Gaillard) Prot.Ep.R.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

Biblical World.

Chicago, December, 1896.

Child prophecies of Isaiah.
 Story of the birth.
 Home of our Lord's childhood.
 Jewish family life.
 Child Jesus in painting.
 Christianity and children.

Christian Literature.

New York, December, 1896.

Augustine and the Pelagian controversy.
 Two archbishops.
 Incarnation: a study of Philipians ii. 5-11.
 Biblical critics on the warpath.
 Ananias of Shirak upon Christmas.
 "As unknown and yet well known."
 Crisis in missions.
 Jubilee of Dr. Richard S. Storrs.
 American Christianity.

The Expositor.

London, December, 1896.

Buhl's new Geography of Palestine and certain geographical problems.
 Christ's attitude to his own death.
 Midrashic element in Chronicles.
 Vicarious heredity: a reading of the child massacre in Bethlehem.
 Homeland of Jesus.
 Reply to Professor Ramsey.

Expository Times.

Edinburgh, December, 1896.

Oldest history of the Semites.
 Book of Job.
 Integrity of Luke i. 5-ii.
 What the Bible teaches about the human body.

The Homiletic Review.

New York, December, 1896.

Apostle Paul as preacher.

Date of Christ's birth.

On the study of poetry by the preacher.

Testimony of Christian students of nature in favor of religion.
 Transition from Hezekiah to Manasseh.

Symposium on the institutional church.

Concerning an ear for music.

The Methodist Review.

New York, November-December, 1896.

When this world is not.

Socialism and the New Testament.

Educational functions of ancient coins.

Three great epochs of world evolution.

Necessity of church-membership.

Studies in recent fiction.

Chinese literati and Peking University.

Liturgical developments of New Testament times.

Language as a fine art.

The Missionary Herald.

Boston, December, 1896.

Henry Martyn Bridgman.

Semi-centennial of the arrival of Rev. Dr. Fairbank.

"Sojourners' Society of Christian Endeavor," of Ku-liang.

Missionary Review.

New York, December, 1896.

Permanent basis of missions.

Jewish question.

Hannah Marshman: first woman missionary.

Christian education in China.

An interesting conversion.

Notes from the diary of a medical missionary.

Jews returning to Palestine.

Jews in Palestine and Syria.

American mission in Egypt.

Twentieth century call to Christendom.
Educational missions.

The New World.

Boston, December, 1896.

Infection of pessimism.
Religious movements in England.
Principle of moral individuality in Catholic Christianity.
Heretics.
Tendencies of thought in the liberal Christian churches of America.
Absence of religion in Shakespeare.
Mr. Gladstone and Bishop Butler.
Religious consciousness of children.
Shinto pantheon.

Preacher's Magazine.

New York, December, 1896.

Christmas meditation.
Story of Gideon.
When Christ was born.
Homiletics.

Protestant Episcopal Review.

Theological Seminary, Virginia,
December, 1896.

Autumnal guest.
Recollections of a long life.
Cecil Frances Alexander.
Bishop Lightfoot and the Christian ministry.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union and its branches.

The Treasury.

New York, December, 1896.

Birth of Christ.
Success in prayer.
Fall of man a stage of human evolution.
Power and importance of the home.

Missionary in Brazil.
Thomas Carlyle.
The Jesuits.
Sunday-school and its relation to the home.

The Yale Review.

New Haven, November, 1896.

Gold and the prices of the products of the farm.
Recent economic and social legislation in the United States.
Shifting of taxes.
Recent legislation in England.
Half a century of improved housing effort by the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.
International bimetallism.

MAGAZINES.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for January contains: "The Story of an Untold Love," Paul Leicester Ford; "A Century of Social Betterment," John Bach McMaster; "Emerson, Sixty Years After," John Jay Chapman; "The House of the Silent Years," Lizzette Woodworth Reese; "Dominant Forces in Southern Life," W. P. Trent; "Cheerful Yesterdays," Thomas Wentworth Higginson; "Memorials of American Authors," Joseph Edgar Chamberlin; "The Juggler," Charles Egbert Craddock; "Park-Making as a National Art," Mary Caroline Robbins; "A Convent Man-Servant," Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "James Lane Allen," Edith Baker Brown; "The Poetry of Rudyard Kipling," Charles Eliot Norton; Mr. Godkin's Political Writings.

THE contents of the CENTURY for January are: "Lenbach: the Painter of Bismarck," Edith

Coues; "Speech and Speech-Reading for the Deaf," John Dutton Wright; "Campaigning with Grant," Horace Porter; "Napoleon's Interest in the Battle of New Orleans," William Hugh Roberts; "Ennui," Grace Denio Litchfield; "Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker," S. Weir Mitchell; "Public Spirit in Modern Athens," D. Bikélas; "The Lights of Sitka," Chester Bailey Fernald; "A Girl of Modern Tyre," Hamlin Garland; "A Wood-Bird's Whim," Sarah Piatt; "The Ladies of Llangollen," Helen Marshall North; "Summer at Christmas-tide," Julian Hawthorne; "The Solitary Woodsman," Charles G. D. Roberts; "Nelson in the Battle of the Nile," Alfred T. Mahan; "An American Composer: Edward A. MacDowell," Henry T. Finck; "A Rose of Yesterday," F. Marion Crawford; "The Absurdity of War," E. L. Godkin.

JANUARY HARPER'S contains: "White Man's Africa," Poultney Bigelow; "The Martian," George Du Maurier; "A Century's Struggle for the Franchise in America," Professor Francis N. Thorpe; "Science at the Beginning of the Century," Henry Smith Williams, M.D.; "Indian Giver," William Dean Howells; "Love's Rosary," G. E. Woodberry; "The Prize-Fund Beneficiary," E. A. Alexander; "Fog Possibilities," Alexander McAdie; "In the Watches of the Night," Brander Matthews; "English Society," George W. Smalley; "Literary Landmarks of Rome," Laurence Hutton; "John Murrell and his Clan," Martha McCulloch-Williams; "One Good Time. A Story," Mary E. Wilkins.

THE contents of LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for January are:

"Stockings Full of Money," Mary Kyle Dallas; "Are American Institutions of Dutch Origin?" Sydney G. Fisher; "A Christmas Midnight in Mexico," Henry Willard French; "South Florida before the Freeze," R. G. Robinson; "Marrying in the Fifteenth Century," Emily Baily Stone; "Robert the Devil," Claude M. Girardeau; "The Western Housekeeper and the Celestial," May Hoskin; "Lines," Julien Gordon; "Theater-Going in St. Petersburg," Isabel F. Hapgood; "An Anonymous Love-Letter," Virginia Woodward Cloud; "With the Whitefish Nets," Allan Hendricks; "Walnut Lore," Lee J. Vance.

McCLURE'S MAGAZINE for January contains: "Grant at West Point. The Story of his Cadet Days," Hamlin Garland; "The Pity of It," Mrs. J. H. Riddell; "Captains Courageous," Rudyard Kipling; "The 'Martha Washington' Case," Lida Rose McCabe; "In a Bowery Regiment. The Story of My First Command," Captain Musgrove Davis; "The Making and Laying of an Atlantic Cable," Henry Muir; "Life Portraits of Great Americans: Fifteen Original Portraits of Benjamin Franklin," Charles Henry Hart; "The Makers of the Union: Benjamin Franklin," W. P. Trent; "The Derelict 'Neptune,'" Morgan Robertson.

JANUARY SCRIBNER'S contains: "The Conduct of Great Businesses," introduction; "The Department Store," Samuel Hopkins Adams; "Soldiers of Fortune," Richard Harding Davis; "A Bystander's Notes of a Massacre: The Slaughter of Armenians in Constantinople," Yvan Troschine; "Thackeray's Haunts and Homes," Eyre Crowe.

A.R.A.; "Perverseness," Rupert Hughes; "Story of a Second Mate," John R. Spears; "Shortening Days," William Cranston Lawton; "The Bashfulness of Bodley," Henry Gallup Paine; "Victor Hugo's Home at Guernsey," G. Jeannot.

LITERARY NOTES.

THE *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* has the following announcement:

"The learned Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Gwynn, is about to publish a most important work, 'The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version hitherto Unknown.' The manuscript from which the text is taken is in the possession of the Earl of Crawford, and it is believed to have in addition a portion of the Muldoonian New Testament. The Provost is understood to attach great importance to this forthcoming work, which will be enriched by Dr. Gwynn's marvellous exactitude of scholarship, and his very intimate acquaintance with Syriac manuscripts. This will be the first Syriac publication issuing from the University Press.

The *Outlook* during the coming year will continue its series of articles on "The Higher Life in American Cities," with similar papers on the higher life of London, by Sir Walter Besant; of Rome, by Professor Rudolfo Lanciani; of Paris, by Rev. Charles Wagner; of Berlin, by Baron Herrmann von Soden; and of Geneva, by Professor Louis Wuarn. The series of articles on "The Messages of the World's Religions" will also be continued. Professor T. W. Rhys Davids treating of Brahmanism; Professor C. R. Lanman, of Buddhism;

Rabbi Gottheil, of Judaism; Rev. George Washburn, of Mohammedanism; Rev. Dr. Arthur H. Smith, of Confucianism; and Dr. Lyman Abbott, of Christianity. An announcement of extraordinary interest is that Justin McCarthy will furnish a "biography in little" of Gladstone, which will be illustrated with drawings and other material gathered from many sources, including a series of photographs made specially for this purpose. Papers on the Congressional Library, on the public libraries of Chicago, and on the Greater New York Library are promised, as well as a host of other good things.

MESSRS MACMILLAN & Co. will shortly publish a work on the times of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, by the late Archbishop Benson. The correction of the final proofs of this work, said to be the labor almost of a lifetime, or of at least thirty years, and to be the late Primate's *magnum opus*, was completed by Dr. Benson while on his tour in Ireland.

DECIDEDLY one of the most interesting facts in recent biographies is brought out in the newly published volume of letters by Lord Blatchford. Lord Blatchford was the most intimate friend of Dean Church, and it appears that both of them were of opinion that "Ecce Homo" was written by their friend Newman. This will help to explain and to make far more interesting the passionate eulogy of that book which Dean Church contributed to the *Guardian*. This criticism was one of the best things Church ever wrote, and we are glad to know that it is to be reproduced in a volume which Messrs. Macmillan will shortly publish.—*British Weekly*.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK are pre-

paring a new and cheap edition of Dr. Robertson Nicoll's book, "The Incarnate Saviour: A Life of Jesus Christ." It will contain a preface discussing the recent attempts to construct a theology from the words of Christ.

MESSRS. EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE published recently a volume entitled "The Hebrew Monarchy," a commentary edited by the Rev. Andrew Wood. It contains a harmony of the parallel texts, and extracts from the prophetic books. There is an introduction by the late Dean Payne Smith, who wrote it just before his death.

DEAN FARRAR has been adopting the *nom de plume* F. T. L. Hope as a writer of fiction. It appears that this stands for "Faintly Trust the Larger Hope."—*British Weekly*.

It is understood that Mr. A. C. Benson will undertake at once the work of preparing a biography of his father, the late Primate.

MR. MURRAY expects to have "The Life of the Rev. Benjamin Jowett" ready early in the spring. It is the joint work of Dr. Evelyn Abbott and the Rev. Dr. Lewis Campbell.

CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY PROFESSOR GEORGE W. GILMORE, A.M.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 10th.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Nov. 10-12.—Fourteenth Annual Session of the <i>Baptist Congress</i>, in Nashville, Tenn.</p> <p>Nov. 11.—Seventy-eighth session of the <i>General Missionary Committee</i> of the <i>Methodist Episcopal Church</i>, in Detroit, Mich.</p> <p>Nov. 12.—Thirtieth Anniversary of the <i>International Committee, Young Men's Christian Association</i>, in New York.</p> <p>Nov. 12-15.—Seventeenth Annual Convention of the <i>Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance</i>, in Chicago.</p> <p>Nov. 13-18.—<i>National Women's Christian Temperance Union</i> Convention, in St. Louis.</p> <p>Nov. 15-20.—First Triennial Convention of the <i>National Council of Jewish Women</i>, in New York City.</p> | <p>Nov. 17.—"Quiet Day" appointed by Evangelical Alliance for the United States.</p> <p>Nov. 17-18.—<i>Baptist Conference on Systematic Beneficence</i>, in Boston.</p> <p>Nov. 17-19.—Third Annual Meeting of the American Congress of Liberal Religious Societies, at Indianapolis.</p> <p>Nov. 17-20.—<i>Protestant Episcopal Church Congress</i>, in Norfolk, Va.</p> <p>Second Annual Convention of the <i>Luther League</i>, in Chicago.</p> <p>Nov. 19.—<i>Fiftieth Anniversary of Dr. Storrs'</i> pastorate of the Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn.</p> <p>Nov. 22.—<i>Temperance Day</i>.</p> <p>Nov. 24.—Annual Meeting of the</p> |
|--|---|

American (Protestant Episcopal) *Church Missionary Society*, in New York City.

Celebration in Baltimore of the Organization of the *First Methodist General Conference* in 1774.

Dec. 1-4.—National Council of the *Union of American He-*

brew Congregations, in Louisville, Ky.

The veteran *Dr. Warneck*, of missionary fame, has retired from active service.

The *Rev. Charles H. Kelly* is *President-Elect* of the London *Metropolitan Free Church Council*.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.

The *Rev. Edward J. O'Shea*, of Portland, Ore., is made *Bishop of Nesqually*, Ore.

The *Very Rev. Father Michael*,

Consultor-General of the Passionist Order, has been nominated *Bishop* of *Soana* and *Pitigliano*.

EPISCOPALIAN.

The *Rev. Edward Carr-Glyn*, Vicar of Kensington, has been nominated *Bishop of Peterborough*, Eng.

The *Rev. George Thorneloe*, M.A., D.C.L., rector of St. Peter's Church, Sherbrooke, is

to be the third *Bishop of Algoma*.

The *Ven. John D. Morrison*, D.D., LL.D., archdeacon of Ogdensburg, N. Y., has been elected *Missionary Bishop* of *Duluth*.

EDUCATIONAL—COLLEGES.

The *Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Conaty*, of Worcester, Mass., has been appointed *Rector* of the *Catholic University* at Washington, D. C.

The *Rev. Dr. H. E. Ryle*, Hulsean Professor of Divinity, has been elected *President* of *Queen's College*, Cambridge,

England, in succession to *Dr. Campion*.

The *Rev. Myron W. Adams*, Ph.D., has been made *dean* of *Atlanta University*.

The *Rev. Dr. D. C. John* has resigned the *presidency* of *Clark University*, Atlanta, Ga.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

Rev. G. Metzger, of Decatur, Ill., has been chosen to the sixth professorship in *Concordia Lutheran Seminary*, St. Louis.

At the recent meeting of the Ohio Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, the *Rev. Edward Herbruck*, D.D., of Dayton, O., was elected to the chair of *Historical Theology*,

and the *Rev. J. H. Bomberger*, A.M., to the *Chair of Practical Theology* in *Heidelberg Theological Seminary* in connection with *Heidelberg University*, Tiffin, O.

Dr. F. S. Hoyt has been added to the faculty of *Baldwin University*, Berea, O., as Professor of *Biblical and Systematic Theology*.

OBITUARY.

Drumm, Rev. Thomas (Protestant Episcopal), *M.A., M.D.* (Johns Hopkins University), in New York City, Oct. 26, aged 73. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, studying medicine there; went to the West Indies (Barbadoes), 1840; emigrated to New York, 1854, and later studied at the General Theological Seminary, graduating in 1856; later he took his degree of M.D. at Johns Hopkins University; he settled as parish priest at Carbondale, Pa., subsequently having charges at Trenton, N. J., and Fordham, N. Y. He enlisted as chaplain in the war and remained till the close of hostilities, when he received a charge at Westfield, N. J.; became chaplain of the Home for Incurables at Fordham, N. Y., 1883; was made chaplain of the Port of New York under the Board of Missions of his church, which office he retained till May of this year.

Fletcher, Rev. John Waltham (Anglican), in Derby, Eng., Nov. 7, aged 80. He received his first education at Bromogrove; matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford; graduated, 1842; was ordained deacon, 1842, priest, 1843; became curate of Holy Trinity, Coventry, 1842; vicar of St. James', Handsworth, 1844; there became one of the pioneers of the Catholic Movement; was made chaplain of Coventry Prison, 1851, and of Leicester County Jail, 1854; became vicar of Narborough and All Saints', Leicester, 1877; later he had charge of Boulton, near Derby. In 1894 he celebrated his golden wedding.

Henderson, Rev. Canon (Anglican), *D.D.* (Trinity College,

Dublin, 1886), in Montreal, Oct. 20, aged 62. Dr. Henderson was a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, where he proceeded to his B.A. with honors in classics and ethics in 1855; took the Divinity Testamur in 1856, proceeded to his M.A. in 1858, and to B.D. and D.D. in 1886; in 1857 he was ordained deacon and served for a year at Brampton Ralph; in 1858 was ordained presbyter by the Bishop of Meath, and held a charge for four years at Ballymore, Westmeath, Ireland; in 1862 he came to Canada, and was appointed to the rectory of Pembroke, Ont.; thence he went to the United States, where he labored for some years; in 1875 he returned to Canada, and became rector of Dunham, Quebec. Here he took an active part in the founding of the Dunham Ladies' College. In 1878 he was appointed Principal of the Montreal Diocesan Theological College, where for a period of nearly twenty years he served the college with great energy and success.

Mechlin, Rev. G. W. (Presbyterian), *D.D.* (Washington and Jefferson College, 1874), in Dayton, Pa., Oct. 26, aged 72. He was born in Butler Co., Pa.; was graduated from Jefferson College; and from Western Theological Seminary, 1856; was ordained pastor at Concord, 1857; removed to Glade Run, 1865, where he passed the rest of his active life; he was principal of the Glade Run Academy for twenty-five years.

Tuttle, Rev. Isaac Henry (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, in New York City, Nov. 20, aged 85. Dr. Tuttle was born in New Haven, February 5, 1811. In 1840 he was received into the priesthood. His first parochial

work was at Bethel, Conn. From there, in 1845, he went to Hudson, N. Y. In 1850 he was called to the rectorship of St. Luke's parish, Hudson Street, this city, which post he occupied forty-one years. His activity in philanthropic lines commenced very soon after he reached New York. He was constantly prominent in all councils of the Episcopal Church, having been many years a member of standing committee of the diocese. At the time of his decease he was rector emeritus of St. Luke's parish.

Van Der Veen, Rev. Christian (Dutch Reformed), *D.D.*, at Grand Rapids, Mich., Oct. 17, aged 56. He was born in Amsterdam, Netherlands; emigrated to Michigan with his family, 1847; studied at what subsequently developed into Hope College; entered Rutgers College, 1854; graduated thence, and from the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1861; accepted call to First Reformed Church of Grand Haven, 1861; removed to Grand Rapids, 1864; became editor of *Hope*, 1871; went to Colorado because of ill health, 1873; resumed pastoral work at Montague Presbyterian Church, 1875; retired in 1888. Along with his clerical duties he served the interests of education; was township superintendent at Grand Haven, and county superintendent later; was a member of the council of Hope College; served again on the school board of Grand Haven.

Viney, Rev. Josiah (English Congregationalist), at Alleyne House, Caterham Valley, Nov. 8, aged 81. He was accepted for service by the London Mission-

ary Society, 1837, but illness prevented his departure; he became assistant to Rev. T. S. Guyer at Ryde; was ordained at Herne Bay, 1841; removed to Bethnal Green, 1844; and, later, to Highgate, where he labored for twenty-five years; subsequently he became secretary of the school for the sons of Congregational ministers at Caterham, and later its president; he was for a time editor of the *Evangelical Magazine*; for thirty years he presided over the annual breakfast connected with that magazine. He was the author of several books.

Campion, Rev. W. M. (Anglican), *D.D.*, President of Queen's College, Cambridge, in Cambridge, Oct. 20.

Crawford, Rev. Morris D. C. (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, in New York City, Nov. 24, aged 78. Dr. Crawford had been in the ministry fifty-six years.

Daniel, Rev. Henry (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, of New Brunswick Conference, Canada, Nov. 7, aged 91. His ministry had lasted sixty-six years.

Ferris, Rev. D. O. (Methodist Episcopal), in Bridgeport, Conn., Nov. 15.

Glyn, Rev. Carr John (Anglican), at Witchampton, Dorset, Oct. 25, aged 98. Mr. Glyn was the uncle of the new Bishop of Peterborough.

Sheeder, Rev. Philip (Lutheran), at Gettysburg, Pa., Oct. 21, aged 78.

Worden, Rev. A. T. (Free Baptist), at Canajoharie, Dec. 6, aged 55.

Wynne, Rt. Rev. F. R. (Anglican, Bishop of Killaloe), in Dublin, Nov. 3.